

NICHOLAS LOVE—A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY TRANSLATOR

By ELIZABETH ZEEMAN

IT is a witness to our incomplete knowledge of fifteenth-century devotional prose that the name of Nicholas Love, Prior of the Carthusian House of Mount Grace in Yorkshire, is not more familiar. For his rendering of the pseudo-Bonaventuran *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, which he called *The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ*, was one of the most popular books of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and contains some of the finest English prose of any time. There are, in fact, few texts which can claim to illustrate so accurately the range and tastes of the devout reading public of the later Middle Ages in England, and, moreover, to point so clearly the contribution made by medieval translators to the general development of English prose style. In spite of this, Love's *Mirror* has not received the attention it deserves.¹

Few facts about Nicholas Love or Louf² have as yet come to light. Nothing is recorded of him until his appointment first as Rector and then as Prior of the newly founded House of Mount Grace in the years 1409 and 1410. Earlier than that, all must be conjecture. The name 'Love', in its various forms, does not seem to have been common in Yorkshire during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is met with, as 'Luff', in the Coventry district at this time, where the Luff family was of some importance, in both civic and ecclesiastical affairs. The south-eastern and east-midland counties, however, yield by far the greatest number of records of the surname. Here again there are ecclesiastical ties; a Nicholas Loof was Vicar of Asheldham, Essex, in 1371, and William Love was Abbot of Coggeshall in 1528. In two cases only is the name connected with Carthusian Houses—once in Coventry, where Richard Luff, at one time mayor of that city, was active in the founding of the Charterhouse of St. Anne's,³ and once in London, where

¹ For brief discussion of *The Mirror*, see: R. W. Chambers, *On the Continuity of English Prose* (Oxford, 1932); M. Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge, 1920); H. S. Bennett, *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1947); S. K. Workman, *Fifteenth Century Translation* (Princeton, 1940); and A. A. Prins, *French Influence in English Phrasing* (Leiden, 1952). No full literary study has been made. There are two fairly recent editions of *The Mirror: The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ*, a modernization, edited by a monk of Parkminster (London, 1926); *The Mirror of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Crist*, ed. L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1911), based on a collation of three manuscripts only. Quotation is made from this edition throughout, unless otherwise stated.

² The 'Louf' spelling of the name is recorded at least twice: in *Annales Ordinis Cartusiensis*, ed. D. C. le Couteaux (Monstrolii, 1891), vii. 74, and in *Ex Chartis Capituli Generalis*, Parkminster MS. B. 77 (inedited).

³ *Annales Ordinis Cartusiensis*, vi. 290.

'Kateryn wyff of Adam Love' was buried in the Charterhouse.¹ The language of *The Mirror* cannot offer any conclusive evidence as to Love's origin; on a first analysis of the manuscripts it seems likely that the basic and probably original dialect used was a variety of that spoken in the north-east midland area.²

Love may have come from one of the other Charterhouses to Mount Grace; he was probably a man of tried experience when he took up the office of Prior in 1409-10.³ It was in 1410 also that his *Mirror of the Blessed Life* received its certificate of approval from Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, and was handed out for copying.⁴ After this, as far as we know, Love undertook no more translation and applied himself for the next eleven years to the administration of Mount Grace. The numerous surviving documents which refer to the affairs of the House during this time make it certain that Love's period of office was full of activity.⁵ Very few of such documents, however, mention him by name—a procedure in keeping with the traditional Carthusian desire for anonymity. In 1415 a grant of an alien priory is made to 'Nicholas, Prior, and the convent of Mount Grace';⁶ there is an undated plea to the Lord Chancellor by 'Nicholas, Prior of the House called Mount Grace', concerning the ownership of certain charters.⁷ In 1415 a general Pardon was granted to 'Nicholas, Prior of the House of Mount Grace and the convent of that place'.⁸ We know that Love resigned the office of Prior in 1421 and died as an ordinary monk in 1424.⁹

To these scanty official records of the author, *The Mirror* itself adds a little information. From Love's additions to the text some idea of the range of his reading emerges. He has an expert knowledge of the Bible, quoting frequently and, in early chapters especially, often modifying his rendering of the *Meditationes* to bring it closer to the wording of the Vulgate. He is well versed in the staple Latin literature of the medieval church—the

¹ W. St. John Hope, *The History of the London Charterhouse* (S.P.C.K., 1925), pp. 101, 102, 104.

² A discussion of the language of the manuscripts of *The Mirror* will form part of the introduction to the critical edition which I am preparing.

³ This date is given in *Annales Ordinis Cartusiensis*, vii. 74, and confirmed by the *Cartusianorum Anglorum Notitia*, Parkminster MS. D. 215, f. 58.

⁴ The certificate states the date: 'circa annum Domini millesimum quadringentesimum decimum'.

⁵ For the history of Mount Grace, see W. Brown, 'Mount Grace Priory', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, xviii (1905), 252-69, and E. M. Thompson, *The Carthusian Order in England* (London, 1930).

⁶ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Henry V, i. 355.

⁷ P.R.O., Early Chancery Proceedings, Bdle. 69, no. 144.

⁸ P.R.O., Pardon Roll, m. 11.

⁹ As stated in *Ex Chartis Capituli Generalis* and in *Cartusianorum Anglorum Notitia*, loc. cit.

writings of St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, and St. Thomas Aquinas. He draws on Latin lives of English saints—those of Edward the Confessor, by Ailred, Cistercian Abbot of Rievaulx, and of St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln and Prior of Witham, the first Carthusian foundation in England.¹

More interesting, perhaps, is what we gather of his reading in English devotional works. There are references to unspecified English treatises—one 'touchynge temptacioun of man in this worlde', and another containing expositions of the Pater Noster.² We know that Love was acquainted with the fourteenth-century English version of Henry de Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae*, for he clearly adapts, without acknowledgement, a Prayer to the Sacrament from this version—the *Treatise of the Seven Points of True Love and Everlasting Wisdom*.³ Moreover, he was probably familiar with the *Ancrene Riwe* and the writings of Walter Hilton. In the chapter on the Feast of the Annunciation Love provides further explanatory matter on the greeting 'Ave Maria'—as he says, 'to sterve thy devocioun the more'—and concludes:

Thus thinketh me may be had contemplacioun more conueniently after the ordre of the fyue ioyes of our lady seynt marye in the forseide gretynge Ave Maria &c. than was bifore writen to the Ankeresse as it scheweth here.

(*Mirror*, p. 36.)

It seems likely that he is referring to the prayer on the Five Joys of Mary which occurs in the first division of the *Ancrene Riwe*.⁴

Walter Hilton is mentioned by name in a passage worth quoting for its warmth of feeling towards the author and his work.⁵ Love has been treating of the contemplative and active lives and passes on to the 'medled lyf':

... who so wole more pleyuely be enformed and tau3t in Englysshe tonge lete him loke the tretys that the worthy clerk and holy lyuere maister Walter hyltoun / the chanoun of thurgartun / wrote in englysche by grace and hi3e discrecioun and he schal fynde there / as I leue / a sufficient scole and a trewe of all thise: whose soule reste in euere lastynge blisse and pees / as I hope he be full hi3e in blisse / ioyned and knytte withouten departynge to his spouse Jesu by parfite use of the beste parte that he chase here with marye / of the which parte he graunt us felawshippe. (p. 165.)

It is tempting to conclude that he felt some special affinity with Hilton's

¹ *The Mirror*, pp. 308, 311.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 99, 112.

³ The prayer in question occurs at the end of the *Tretys of the hizeste and moste worthy sacrament of cristes blessed body*, which Love appended to *The Mirror*. See G. Schleich, *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*, clvii (1930), 26-34.

⁴ *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwe*, ed. M. Day (E.E.T.S., o.s. 225, 1952), pp. 16-17.

⁵ This passage helps to date the writing of *The Mirror*, for Hilton's death, assumed here by Love, took place in 1396.

writings; their devotion is of similar moderate temper, and so too are their prose styles.¹

But Love is not only interested in orthodox literature. Part of the purpose of the translation was the correction of unorthodox religious doctrine of the time—in particular, that taught by the Lollards. Love's frequent censure of the Lollards throughout *The Mirror*, and his addition of a *Treatise on the Sacrament* to the main body of the work in an effort to counter one tenet of theirs, show him dealing vigorously with important contemporary problems—problems facing not only the religious orders and the lay clergy but those in secular estate also. Love speaks emphatically about past and present dangers for, as he sees it, 'thus ȝit in oure dayes hath antecrist wrouȝt . . . by this false maister of lollardes / and many othere of his disciples / into destruccioun of trewe cristen byleue . . .'.²

On rare occasions Love allows himself to describe personal experience; in the following passage, for instance, he puts the matter obliquely, but it is possible to feel that the words draw on his own knowledge of spiritual ecstasy:

There is one persone that I knowe now lyuynge / and perauenture there ben many more that I knowe not in the self degre or hiȝere / the which persone often tymes / whan oure lord Jesu voucheth sauſe to touche hym of his grace / in trefynge of that blissed sacrament with the inwarde ȝiȝt of his soule and deuowte meditacioun of his preciouſe passioun / sodeynly feleth also ſched in to the self body a ioye and a likynge that paſſith with oute comparisoun the hyȝeste likynge that any creature may haue or fele as by way of kynde in this lyf: thorūȝ the which ioye and likynge alle the membres of the body ben enflawmed of ſo delectable and ioyfulle an hete / that hym thinketh ſenſibly all the body as it were meltinge for ioye / as waxe doth anentes the hote fyre:³ ſo ferforth that the body myȝt not bere that excellent likynge / bot that it ſcholde utterly faille / nere the graciouſe kepynge and ſuſteynynge of the toucher / oure lorde Jesu / abouen kynde. (pp. 208-9.)

The Mirror cannot, obviously, be expected to increase our knowledge of Love himself by a great amount of detail. Yet the general impression of the author, built up almost imperceptibly in his book, is positive and interesting, and suits well with the external facts; here is a man of wide but not

¹ The works of Love and Hilton appear together in some manuscripts—as in C.U.L. MS. Additional 6686 and Chetham MS. 6690. Hilton himself had certain connexions with the Carthusians; his *Epistola Aurea* was written to his friend Adam Horsley, who became a Carthusian at Beauvale, Notts., sometime after 1375. See H. Gardner, 'Walter Hilton and the Mystical Tradition in England', *Essays and Studies*, xxii (1937), 107, 111.

² *The Mirror*, pp. 320-1.

³ It is significant, in view of Love's acknowledgement of Hilton, that this 'wax and fire' image is close to that in *The Scale of Perfection*, Bk. ii, ch. 41, 'and makith þine herte melte delectably as waxe aȝenſt þe fire into ſofterneſſe of his loue . . .' (Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. 15. 18., f. 106b).

unusual learning, alive to difficulties encountered by all classes of the devout, one whose experience of the contemplative life did not make him any the less able to administer a Carthusian House at a busy period of its history.

Love chose to translate one of the best-known texts of the Middle Ages—the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, composed by a thirteenth-century Franciscan for a woman religious.¹ The *Meditationes*, re-creating the events of the life of Christ in imaginative detail, affected medieval art and literature strongly; especially powerful were those sections devoted to the Childhood and the Passion, for here the dramatic and descriptive talents of the writer are employed to best advantage.² Its influence is first seen in English literature of the late thirteenth century, and during the following century several partial versions were made.³ Love's *Mirror* is, however, the first complete English translation of the *Meditationes* and probably the most important of all the vernacular renderings. Its popularity seems to have been both rapid and sustained throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Thirty-eight complete manuscript copies of widely varying date and provenance have already been traced.⁴ Its first two editions were printed by Caxton in 1486 and 1495, and seven more followed before 1530. It appears frequently as a bequest in fifteenth-century wills.⁵ One of the most interesting comments on the esteem in which it was held as late as 1532 comes from Sir Thomas More, who recommends it in company with Hilton's *Scale of Perfection* and the *Imitation of Christ* as reading matter preferable to the controversial literature on which he was then engaged.⁶ The unabated demand for 'such English books as may nourish and increase devotion'—to use More's own words—serves to emphasize the strong lines of cultural and religious continuity between the medieval and early Tudor periods.

The conditions for which Love's translation was made differ consider-

¹ Ed. A. C. Peltier, *Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae* (Paris, 1868), xii. 509-630. For discussion of date and authorship of the *Meditationes*, see the Quaracchi edition of the *Works* of St. Bonaventura (Ad Claras Aquas, 1882-1902), viii. 112 and x. 25, and also M. Deanesly, 'The Gospel Harmony of John de Caulibus', *British Society of Franciscan Studies*, x (1922).

² See E. Mâle, *L'Art religieux de la fin du Moyen Âge en France* (Paris, 1922) and E. Roy, *Le Mystère de la Passion en France* (Dijon, 1903). The numerous vernacular renderings of the work are discussed briefly by P. L. Oliger, *Le Meditationes Vitae Christi del pseudo-Bonaventura* (Arezzo, 1922).

³ Some of these translations are listed by M. Deanesly in *The Lollard Bible* and in 'The Gospel Harmony of John de Caulibus', loc. cit.

⁴ There are, also, a number of extracts from *The Mirror* in various fifteenth-century manuscript collections. In compiling a full list of manuscripts of *The Mirror*, and of other English versions of the *Meditationes*, I have received much valuable help from Mr. A. I. Doyle, of Durham University Library.

⁵ M. Deanesly lists some of these bequests in 'Vernacular Books in England in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', *M.L.R.*, xv (1920), 354-5.

⁶ See his *Works* (1557), p. 867.

ably from those of the original Latin composition. In the first place Love addresses his book not only to those of the contemplative but also to those of the active life. His own Preface to *The Mirror* shows that, like many other fifteenth-century translators, he has a wide, predominantly unlearned public in view:

Wherefore now bothe men and women and euery age and euery dignyte of this worlde is stired to hope of everelastyng lyf. And for this hope and to this intente / with holy writt also ben writen dyuerse bookes and tretees of deuouyt men: not onliche to clerkes in latyn but also in english to lewed men and wommen and hem that ben of symple understandyng. . . . The whiche scripture and writyng / for the fructuose mater ther of sterynge specially to the love of Jesu / semeth amonge othere souereynly edifienge to symple creatures: the whiche as children hauen nede to be fedde with mylke of lyzte doctrine / and not with sadde mete of grete clergie and hiȝe contemplacioun. Wherefore / at the instaunce and the prayer of somme deuoute soules / to edificacioun of suche men or wommen is this drawyng out of the forsaide book of cristes lyf wryten in english. . . . (p. 8.)

Secondly, *The Mirror* has a special polemical purpose—that of challenging and refuting Lollard doctrine.¹ It is to these changed circumstances—the less specialized public and the immediate controversial issue—that *The Mirror* owes its general differences of character from the *Meditationes*. The first explains its reduced content; 161 chapters in the *Meditationes* appear as sixty-three in *The Mirror*. Love cuts down doctrinal material; in the section dealing with Christ's Ministry, for example, we find him stating characteristically:

But for also moche as it were long werk and perauenture tedyouse / bothe to the rederes and the hereres her of / ȝif alle the processe here of the blessed lyf of Jesu schulde be writen in Englishe so fully . . . therfore here after many chapitres and longe processe / that semeth litel edificacioun inne as to the manere of symple folk that this book is specially writen too / schal be lafte unto it drawe to the passioun. . . . (p. 100.)

He also omits or condenses many of the discussions and references to the contemplative life, as being relevant to the limited public for whom the original author wrote—the 'gostly lyveres'—rather than to 'comoun per-sones and symple soules'.²

The additions he makes are no less in the interests of a varied class of readers; explanation of difficult points and provision of further affective comment are all prompted by the same desire—that of making the text accessible to all. Thus before dealing with the Last Supper he tells his readers that because

¹ It is interesting to see that a Trinity College, Cambridge, manuscript of *The Mirror* was read and corrected by one of Lollard sympathies—on f. 129a of MS. B. 15. 32 there is considerable scratching through and a marginal note: 'Do not beleue thys folesshnes'.

² *The Mirror*, p. 158.

in this processe is the most strengthe and goostly fruyte of all the meditaciouns that ben of the blissed lyf of oure lorde Jesu . . . we schulle not abregge as we have in other places but rather lengthe it in processe. (pp. 197-8.)

To the second change of circumstance are due the numerous attacks throughout *The Mirror* 'contra Lollardos'¹ and the appended, seemingly original, 'Treatise on the Sacrament'.

But in the general nature of content and its disposition, *The Mirror* agrees with the *Meditationes*. It combines narrative, didactic comment and imaginative description as does the Latin work and, for the most part, preserves the original sequence of events. Similarly, *The Mirror* is most striking for its realistic and compassionate approach to the life of Christ, and, like the *Meditationes*, is rich with what Love calls 'deuoute ymaginaciouns', ranging from the Nativity to the Ascension. The quality of the writing can be judged from this extract, which is part of the chapter on the Nativity:

And anon sche / deuoutly enclynande / with souereyne ioye toke hym in hir armes and swetely clippyng and kessynge leyde hym in hir barme / and with a fulle pap / as sche was tauzt of the holy goost / wische hym al aboute with hir swete mylk: and so wrapped hym in the keuerchiefes of hir heued and leide hym in the cracche. And anone the Oxe and the Asse / knelynge down / leyden her mowthes on the cracche / brethyng at hir nes es uppon the child / as they knewen by resoun that in that colde tyme the childe so sympely hiled had nede to be hatte in that manere. And then his moder knelynge down worschipped and loued god / inwardely thonkyng and seienge in this manere: Lord god / I thonke the with all my myzt that haste 3eu en me thy dere sone and I honoure the al myzty god / goddes sone and myn. Joseph / also honourynge and worschippyng the childe god and man / toke the sadel of the Asse and made thereof a kushyne oure lady to sitte on and a suppoyle to lene to. (p. 47.)

Love has no specific comment on his dealings with the Latin text² as far as prose style is concerned, but it is clear that he regards his original with critical respect. Thus where Latin grammatical constructions can be carried over directly into English with no straining of the native idiom, Love will often translate closely. Here, for instance, the correspondence between Latin and English is fairly strict; only minor structural changes have been made:

O grandis amor! vere in finem dilexit eos, cum in tanta positus agonia eorum procurat quietem. Videbat autem a longe adversarios suos venientes cum facibus et armis, nec tamen discipulos excitavit, nisi cum prope et iuxta eos erant, tunc dicit eis:

Sufficit, satis dormistis, ecce qui me tradet, appropinquat.

(*Meditationes*, p. 602.)

¹ pp. 121, 187, 193, 208.

² The suggestion made by A. A. Prins, op. cit., that Love had a French as well as a Latin text of the *Meditationes* at hand as he translated, seems an unnecessary complication.

O trewe loue / sothely he loued hem into the uttrest that in so grete anguysshe and so bittre agonye was so besy to procure hir hele and hir reste. Than sawe oure lord after his adversaries comynge with torches and armes / and ȝit he wolde not wake and raise his disciples til thai come nyh ham / amd than he seide to hem:

It sufficeth now that ye haue slepte y-nowe.¹ Loo he that schal betraye me is nyh at hande. (*Mirror*, p. 224.)

And here Love obtains a dramatic short sentence almost straight from the Latin:

Hic requieuit filius meus et hic est pretiosissimus sanguis ejus. (*Meditationes*, p. 611.)

Here made my sone his ende and here is his precious blode. (*Mirror*, p. 254.)

On the other hand, he shows a strong tendency to alter and adapt Latin constructions in what seems to be an effort to produce a style of writing nearer to characteristic English speech idiom. We see him working away from the condensed and abrupt towards the loose and expansive in grammatical form. So participial constructions are often 'opened' into full clauses:

Sic ergo aptato corpore. . . . (*Meditationes*, p. 610.)

When they haue thus done and dressed the body. . . . (*Mirror*, p. 251.)

Domina surgens et genuflectens, sepulchrum amplexatur. . . . (*Meditationes*, p. 611.)

And therwith oure Lady riseth up and with all hem knelynge,² blessedde and kissede the sepulchre. . . . (*Mirror*, p. 254.)

The relative construction is preferred to a series of phrases in apposition: . . . recessit nobis gaudium nostrum, dulcedo nostra, et lumen oculorum nostrorum. . . . (*Meditationes*, p. 611.)

. . . he is gone away fro us: he that was al oure ioye and oure comforte and the lizt of oure eizen. . . . (*Mirror*, pp. 255-6.)

Love's varied procedure, as he both imitates and changes the grammatical structures of his original, is most strikingly illustrated from formal prose writing. Here, in a passage shaped on rhetorical lines with elaborate balance of sentence parts, Love skilfully preserves the general design of the Latin but, at the same time, 'naturalizes' certain features. The Archangel Michael speaks to Christ in Gethsemane:

Confortamini ergo et viriliter agite: excelsum enim decet magna facere et

¹ Some manuscripts, such as the early C.U.L. Additional 6578, read simply 'It sufficeth now, ye have slepte'.

² Love's text of the *Meditationes* must have differed slightly from the Peltier reading here, but this does not lessen the value of the quotation.

magnanimum ardua tolerare. Cito pertransibunt poenalia et succedunt perpetuo gloriosa. (*Meditationes*, p. 601.)

Beth now of good comfort / my lord and worcheth manfully: for it is semely to hym that is in hize degre to do grete thinges and worthy /

and to hym that is a manful man to suffre hard thinges: for tho thinges that ben harde and payneful schal sone passe / and thoo thinges that ben ioyful and gloriouse schal come after. (*Mirror*, p. 223.)

It is true, however, that Love does not always achieve—or, seemingly, try to achieve—this tactful compromise between idiomatic ease and formality of expression. The long sentence composed of a series of loosely linked clauses is not infrequent in *The Mirror*, and is usually built up from several shorter Latin sentences. But it would be a mistake to assume that length and informal plan must imply confusion. If the prose concerned is argument, then the line of thought remains clear throughout; if it is description, as in the Passion chapters, then looseness of grammatical texture is more often than not, by its dramatic effect, appropriate to the situation.¹ In the following quotations each English sentence is made up of two or more of the Latin; the structure is by no means taut, yet neither passage lacks clarity or fluency:

Wherefore at this tyme we schulle specially note that oure lorde bygan this sermone firste at pouerte / doynge us to undirstonde that pouerte is the firste grounde of all goostly exercise: for he that is ouerleide and charged with temporel goodes and worldely riches may not frely and swiftly folowe crist / that is the myrour and ensauple of pouerte: namely he that hath his likynge and his affeccioun undir these worldely goodes / for he is not fre / but thralle and as in bondage of hem. (*Mirror*, pp. 109-10.)

And so is that moste innocent / fairest and clenest flesch / flour of all mankinde / alto rente and fulle of woundes / renninge out on all sides that precious kynges blood / and so longe beten and scourged with wounde upon wounde and brisour upon brisour til bothe the lokeres and the smy3ters were very: and than was he beden to be unbounde. (pp. 229-30.)

The *Meditationes*, faithful to the traditions of a great deal of Latin religious prose, employs rhetorical figures of style and has a strong rhythmical content, especially in writing of high emotional temper. Here again, Love follows the general lines suggested by his original, but modifies and inno-

¹ Dr. S. K. Workman, in his study *Fifteenth Century Translation*, criticizes many medieval prose writers for similar habits of composition—among others, Walter Hilton. There seems, however, little evidence that such habits are any real disadvantage to Hilton or Love in dealing with extremely varied, often complex, material. Nothing is gained, therefore, by objecting to such usages on purely formal grounds; each sentence or sentence group must be judged by its effectiveness in the immediate context.

vates.¹ This is clear from a comparison of the English and Latin versions of a lament for the Virgin as she begs the soldiers to spare the body of Christ:

O Domina, quid est quod agitis?

Ad pedes nefandissimorum statis ibi oratis inexorabiles.

Pietate creditis flectere crudelissimos et impiissimos et humiliare superbos? Abhominatio est superbis humilitas: incassum laboratis. (*Meditationes*, p. 608.)

A lady, what do 3e?

3e lowen 3ow to the feete of hem that bene most wickede: and prayen hem that hauen no reward to eny good prayer.

Suppose 3e to bowe by 3oure pitee hem that bene moste cruel and most wicked / with out pitee? or to overcome hem that bene alther proudest with mekenesse? Nay / for proude men haue abhominacioun of mekenesse: wherefore 3e travaile in veyne. (*Mirror*, p. 246.)

Here the sequence of '... prayen ... prayer' and '... proudest ... mekenesse ... proude ... mekenesse' has been suggested by the Latin '... oratis inexorabiles' and '... humiliare superbos ... superbis humilitas'. Both can be defined as examples of the 'figure' of polyptoton—elaborate verbal play upon a word root. But the interlocked repetition in '... wickede ... pitee ... wicked ... pitee' is original to Love and he has made no attempt to imitate the Latin in its heavy use of rhymed word-endings—the 'figure' of homoeoteleuton.

Repetition, either simple or in the specialized form of polyptoton, is strongly favoured by Love:

And after sche hadde kau3t spirite and byhelde hir sone so greuously wounded / was also wounded in hert with a newe wounde of sorwe. (*Mirror*, p. 246.)

There is no hint of this in the Latin:

Postea suspirat et anxiatur et respiciens filium suum vulneratum, dolore mortis atteritur. (*Meditationes*, p. 608.)

A prayer to Christ after the Crucifixion contains further examples of Love's dealings with the stylistic features of his Latin text:

Exurge ergo, gloria mea ... consoletur me tuus reditus quam sic contristavit discensus. (*Meditationes*, p. 617.)

¹ In the absence of comment by the writers themselves, it is difficult to tell whether the introduction of rhetorical 'figures' into medieval English prose is deliberate, or whether it results from unconscious imitation of Latin practice. See, on this point, the recent articles by M. Morgan, dealing with one kind of medieval vernacular prose which appears to be as elaborately and intentionally styled as any Latin: 'A Treatise in Cadence', *M.L.R.*, xlvii (1952), 156-64 and 'A Talkyng of the Love of God', *R.E.S.* n.s. iii (1952), 97-116.

Arise up therefore now al my ioye / and comferte me with thyn a3eyn comynge / whom thou so discomfortest thoru3 thyn awaie passynge. (*Mirror*, p. 263.)

Not only has Love imitated the fall of like endings in the Latin '... reditus ... discessus ...' by his '... comynge ... passynge ...' but he has strengthened the balance of the two clauses in which they occur by his play on '... comferte ... discomfortest ...' and by the close parallelism of sound and syntax in the concluding words of each part—'... thyn a3eyn comynge ... thyn awaie passynge'.

As with the prose of the *Meditationes*, the rhythmical content of the English rendering, at times of heightened emotion, is very pronounced. Christ's journey to the river Jordan, where he is to be baptized, calls forth this exclamation which shows Love using alliteration and assonance to stress a powerful rhythmical base:

A lord Jesu / 3e that ben kyng of all kynges / whider goo 3ee in this manere allone? Gode lorde / where ben 3oure dukes and erles / kniztes and barouns / horses and harneises / chariotes and someres / and alle youre seruauntes and mynystres that schulde be aboute 3ow / to kepe 3ow fro the comoun peple in manere of kynges and lordes? Where ben the trumpes and clariouns and alle other mynstralcie / and herbergeres and purveyoures that schulde goo byfore / and alle othere worshippes and pompes of the worlde as we wrecched wormes usen?

Be 3e not that hi3e lorde of whose ioye and blisse hevене and erthe is replenesched?

Why than goo 3e thus sympilly / allone / and on the bare erthe? . . .

Why folwe we not after the? Why lowe we not and meke not oure self? Why loue we and holde we and coueite we so besily worschippes and pompes and vanytees of the worlde? (*Mirror*, pp. 85-86.)

The general movement of the English is modelled on that of the Latin, but to see that this is not slavish imitation, we have only to compare the last sentence:

Quare honores et pompas, caduca et vana sic avidē poscimus et tenemus? (*Meditationes*, p. 534.)

The presence, in Love's prose, of the rhythmical 'cursus' endings for sentence, clause, or phrase, is, as with most medieval English prose texts, a debatable matter.¹ Undoubtedly in some of the extracts already quoted there are rhythmical units which strongly resemble the Latin 'clausulae', allowing for differences of native stress. Love may have been adapting, perhaps unconsciously, the rhythms of the Latin he had before him. Thus,

¹ The imitation of Latin cursus endings in English prose is discussed by M. W. Croll in 'The Cadence of English Oratorical Prose', *S.P.*, xvi (1919), 1-55. For more recent comments, see M. Morgan, 'A Treatise in Cadence', loc. cit.

in the passage describing Christ's journey to the Jordan, the movement, if not always the sense, of '... dukes and erles, kniztes and barouns, horses and harneises, chariotes and someres . . .' is roughly equivalent to the Latin '... barones et comites, duces et milites, equi et cameli, elephantes et currus . . .'. But it is obvious that in this matter, too, Love composes freely, without strict reference to his Latin original. For his general practice of expanding Latin words into double English phrases seems to result, more often than not, from a desire to produce exactly this sort of rhythmical unit. So 'magnifica' appears as 'grete thinges and worthy', 'poenalia' as 'harde and peynful', 'gloriosa' as 'ioyful and gloriouse'.¹ Love would, no doubt, be familiar with the Latin cadences from reading outside the *Meditationes*, and it seems most likely that, if his work is indebted to the cursus system, it is in a general, not specific, way.

Although Love's prose often moves to a distinctive rhythmical pattern, at no time does it approach the degree of elaborate cadence found in some medieval prose texts.² The rhythms, for the most part, stress the sense, following and not dictating the lines of syntax and grammar.

The quality of the translated prose of *The Mirror* can be demonstrated by comparing it with some of the partial English renderings made during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries:

Now take hede how this blessed lady
/ quene of heuene and of erthe / gothe
allone with hir spouse / and that not
uppon horse / bot on foote. Sche ledeth
noz3t with hir many bouremaydens and
damyseles: but sothely there gooth
with hir a wel better companye / and
that is pouert / mekenes / and honeste
schamfastnes / 3e and plente of alle
vertues: (*Mirror*, p. 37.)

Sche toke Joseph forþ and went with
him, not on his hors bak, but on fote,
with no grete companye of dameselles
but pai bope be hemself, and per went
with hem pouerte and mekenes,
schamefastnes and honeste of alle ver-
tues. . . (Trinity College, Cambridge,
MS. B. 2. 18, f. 12 b.)

Conspice ergo hic quomodo vadit solo cum sponso Regina coeli et terrae; et non eques sed pedes; non ducit frequentiam militum vel baronum, non camerarium et domicellarum comitivam. Vadunt autem cum ea paupertas, humilitas et verecundia, omnium virtutum honestas. (*Meditationes*, p. 516.)

Loo now hongeth oure lorde on the
crosse dede / and all that grete multi-

Beholde now how thi Lorde Jhesus
honge dede on þe crosse for þi lufe.

¹ See the passage quoted on p. 121 above.

² Such prose as that found in some of the thirteenth-century devotional texts from the west of England—the *Wooing of our Lord*, *An Orison of our Lord*—or in the connected fourteenth-century *A Talking of the Love of God*, of which Miss Morgan, in 'A Treatise in Cadence', p. 164, says 'rhythmic pattern, indeed, might well be regarded as the dominant feature'.

tude goth awaie toward the citee. All þe multitude of þe folke, where þene gone home. . . . (*The Privy of the Mirror*, p. 243.)

(*The Privy of the Passion*, ed. C. Horstmann, *Yorkshire Writers* (London, 1896), i. 207.)

For lo þe lord hangyd deed on þe cros and all þe multitude of peple departed away. . . . (Caius College, Cambridge, MS. 669, f. 53a.)

Ecce ergo pendet Dominus in cruce mortuus; reedit tota multitudo. (*Meditationes*, p. 607.)

The greater stylistic assurance of Love's writing is undeniable; he manages, however, to convey the sense of the Latin directly, without either terseness or excessive ornament.

Love's original composition differs very little from his translated work. Thus we may find a pair of rhymed words emphasizing careful balance of sentence parts:

This is a pyteful siȝt and a ioyful siȝt: a pyteuouse siȝt in hym for that harde passioun that he suffrede for oure sauacioun: but it is a likyng siȝt to us for the matere and the effecte that we haue therby of oure redempcioun. (*Mirror*, p. 244.)

Repetition is still the favourite device; here the Feast of Pentecost is described:

This is a worthy feste: and this is / among othere / a swete and a louely feste: for this is the feste of hym that is loue properly / as Seynt Gregorie seith / that the holy goost is loue. Wherefore he that loueth god schulde in this feste specially be enflawmed with loue or / at the leste / with a brennyng desire to loue. (p. 298.)

And, in the passage which ends the main part of *The Mirror*,¹ Love shows how, with fairly loose grammatical structures, he can employ some of the rhythms and figures of rhetorical practice and yet retain a fine simplicity of sense:

Wherefore that we mowe be able to resceyve here that grete gifte of the holy gooste and his coumforte / and after come to that blisse that oure lorde Jesu is now steye up to and hath made our wey bfore us / leue we and hate we all false loue and likyng of this wrecched worlde: and sette we not oure loue on the stynkyng flesche / and norisshe we it not in desires: but desire we contynuelly forto be departed therfro so that thoruȝ the grace of the holy goost helpynge us / we mowe folowe sumwhat the blessed lyf of oure lorde Jesu in this world and after goo up to hym and to oure kynde heritage of blisse in the gloriouse citee of heuenly Jerusalem / where he / souereyn kyng / lyueth and regneth with oute ende. (pp. 299-300.)

¹ If this passage was suggested by the Latin of the *Meditationes*, p. 627, Love's treatment of it is so extremely free that it amounts to original composition.

As the evidence shows, Love's prose style benefited a good deal from a close relationship with the *Meditationes*. On the other hand, he was obviously capable of producing sound, idiomatic English without the help of a Latin source. It is, perhaps, the balance of two things—a willingness to learn from other literature, and a strong feeling for the natural idiom and rhythm of a spoken language—which accounts for his equal success as translator and original prose writer.

The value of making a study of Love's *Mirror* does not lie solely in what we learn from it of one work or one author of the early fifteenth century. *The Mirror* contributes to a tradition of vernacular prose writing first established through the educational efforts of King Alfred—a tradition which continues unchecked during the Old and Middle English periods.¹ Love dedicates himself to the same cause as others before him; his choice of a text and his method of procedure are both determined by a concern for the needs of 'symple soules'.² Excellent as his book is, it does not stand alone, whether as translation, prose style, or devotion. It reminds us of how much remains to be done towards a sound estimate of medieval religious prose. For we need not only further knowledge of texts—many of which are still unpublished and unknown³—but a more satisfactory critical approach to this writing as a whole. While individual treatises have been dealt with sympathetically, a comprehensive and reliable survey is still to come. Professor Chambers, in what has been called his 'pioneer article' setting out the case for the continuity of English prose, was concerned primarily with content and spirit, and therefore neglected style. This has been remedied to some extent; Dr. S. K. Workman and Professor A. A. Prins, for instance, have provided valuable detailed information on the syntax and vocabulary of medieval prose. Their general statements, however, are conditioned by the specialist nature of their interests, and are of limited usefulness only.⁴

No critical study, examining continuity of style in medieval prose as distinct from the more easily proved continuity of subject-matter and intention, has fully emphasized the contrast between the prose of *The Mirror* and some alliterative, cadenced prose of the period—notably that produced

¹ The foundations for any study of this prose tradition were laid in 1932 by Professor R. W. Chambers in *On the Continuity of English Prose*.

² See the quotation from *The Mirror* on p. 118 above.

³ As, for instance, the inedited fifteenth-century *Life of Christ*, the *Speculum Devotorum*, or *Mirror to Devout People*, found only in C.U.L. MS. Gg. 1. 6 and Foyle MS.

⁴ Such statements as 'nothing could be more un-English than Love's translation of the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*' from Professor Prins's study, *French Influence in English Phrasing*, illustrate the disadvantages of the 'specialist approach'; it is difficult to reconcile his judgement with prose of this kind: 'Wepeth not' for the wenche is not dede / but slepeth' (*The Mirror*, p. 167).

in the west midland area in the thirteenth century,¹ and fourteenth-century work connected with it.² On the one hand, we have a prose moderately elegant, making a discreet use of ornament to stress patterns of thought and emotion, and on the other, an elaborate, semi-poetic prose, often associated with equally elaborate Latin models. The recognition that widely differing types of writing are to be found within the religious tradition is forced upon us not only by Love's *Mirror*, but by many other texts, translated and original; avoiding bare simplicity, they nevertheless stand out against the extremes of 'high style' referred to above. Thus the prose of Walter Hilton, of Dame Julian of Norwich, or of many anonymous translators working in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,³ has more in common with *The Mirror* than with the thirteenth-century *Wooing of our Lord* or with the later *A Talking of the Love of God*.

In this connexion the predominantly eastern character of the language of *The Mirror* may be worth notice. The east of England is, during the Middle English period, an area of great and increasing importance in the history of the development of literary prose. From the early thirteenth century onwards, the east easily outstrips the west in the number and quality of the prose works which come from its counties. It is remarkable, moreover, that few of these texts show a tendency towards the highly rhetorical style which can be found frequently, if not consistently, in contemporary prose of the west of the country. Hilton, the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Dame Julian of Norwich, and Nicholas Love write from the east, and although their prose varies greatly from one to another, they all reject sustained alliteration, elaborate cadence, and accumulation of imagery. The 'continuity of English devotional prose' is certainly not as clear-cut a matter as it appeared to be when first stated.⁴ Texts such as Love's *Mirror*, in language and style, indicate one of the paths future inquiry could profitably take.

¹ The meditative pieces, *The Wooing of our Lord, An Orison of our Lord*, ed. R. Morris, *Old English Homilies* (E.E.T.S., o.s. 34, 1868) or parts of the Saints' Lives of the Katherine Group. D. Bethurum in *J.E.G.P.*, xxxiv (1935), 553-64, draws attention to the variety of style found in these western writings.

² *A Talking of the Love of God*, ed. Sister M. Salvina Westra (The Hague, 1950), provides an example. Rolle's prose is sometimes lavishly ornamented, but he can also write in a moderate style, not unlike that of Hilton or Love.

³ The fourteenth-century translator of Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae*, for instance, expresses a conviction shared by Hilton and Love, as by Ælfric much earlier—one of great importance in determining the quality of their writing—that the 'sentence' must be 'most opune to the comine understandynge' (*The Seven Points of True Love*, ed. C. Horstmann, *Anglia*, x (1888), 325).

⁴ So the dialogue from Essex of about 1200, the *Vices and Virtues* ed. F. Holthausen (E.E.T.S., o.s. 89, 159, 1888, 1921), may merit closer attention. For its dialect and for its moderate style, it has as much to say of prose yet to come in the following centuries as the better-known contemporary writings from the west of England.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY: SOME SUPPLEMENTARY GLOSSES

By HILDA HULME

IT is not always realized to what extent we may be hampered in interpreting, from the printed text, such forms of past literature as were composed primarily in the spoken form of the language, by the assumption that the relevant lexical record, derived in the main from printed sources, is, if not indeed sufficiently complete, at least incapable of any very considerable expansion. We are told that 'the N.E.D. collection of material is not likely to need improving except in minor detail. The idea of a still bigger dictionary than the N.E.D. is obviously impracticable if not ludicrous'.¹ The successful concentration of historical linguistic study on the development of the standard form of the language has contributed to this situation. Jespersen states: 'The standard language is the most important form of the English language; I believe its development has been in the main independent of dialectal change.'² Tracing this evolving 'standard English' through the medium of written records, we have given the notion a premature reality, forgetting the limitations of our material and our approach. Concurring in the judgement that 'Attempts to find traces of Shakespeare's Warwickshire origin in his language have proved inconclusive',³ we arrive with Professor Kökeritz at the opinion that 'in the course of time [Shakespeare's] own speech appears to have become virtually indistinguishable from the general pattern of good colloquial English then spoken in London. Sporadically we hear echoes of something different, something that may derive from his adolescent years in Stratford, but our imperfect knowledge of the early modern history of most English dialects hardly permits us to label these forms as genuine Warwickshire elements in his speech.'⁴ It is certainly beyond the limits of our present knowledge to characterize phonological features of local varieties of English in Shakespeare's time. Mr. Kökeritz himself has elsewhere made a distinguished contribution to such regional study, but a general assault on the problem

¹ W. Empson, *The Structure of Complex Words* (London, 1951), p. 391. This remark has been unfairly torn from its context. It will be clear from my own work how much I have found of value in Professor Empson's methods and achievements.

² O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (London, 1949), I. vi.

³ G. D. Willcock, 'Shakespeare and Elizabethan English', *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 120.

⁴ H. Kökeritz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (London, 1953), p. 5.

has yet to be made. Meanwhile, in neglecting the linguistic evidence of unpublished local archives, we remain unaware of the degree to which the present lexical record is fortuitously incomplete.

Few will question that the records of Stratford might yield evidence which bears directly on the meaning of Shakespeare's text. It is not my purpose here to offer more than an earnest of such direct evidence. The etymology of Shakespeare's *aroint* is unknown; of its meaning we know only that it collocates with *thee, witch!* in Shakespeare's usage (*Macbeth*, I. iii. 6, 'Aroynt thee, Witch, the rumpe-fed Ronyon cryes', and *Lear*, III. iv. 129, 'He met the Night-Mare, . . . Bid her a-light, and her troth-plight, And aroynt thee Witch, aroynt thee').¹ A relevant extract from a Stratford presentment (Misc. I, 160. ?1627) affords another instance where the word is so collocated: 'holds or sayth goodie bromlie is an ill lookd wooman' (then going on without a break into the direct speech of the complainant) 'an I woold over looke her & herne as I had over looke others and bid me arent the wich & sayde I was a whore & my bastards mayntayne me & bid me get hone how woold brushe the motes forth of my durtie gowne.' The variant spellings *aroint*, *aroynt*, *arint* (*Lear*, Quartos), *arent* are, I suggest, to be regarded as evidence of that diaphonic overlapping in Elizabethan English which results, in unsophisticated orthography, in spelling forms such as *layme*, *loime* 'lime', *pains* 'pints', *pyntyng* 'pointing', *pyd* 'paid', *weyne* 'wine', *cheld* 'child'.² The possibility of overlap in Elizabethan speech of ME. *i*/ME. *oi* is generally accepted (e.g. Kökeritz, pp. 216, 217), and manuscript records of the Midland counties provide strong evidence for the overlap of ME. *i*/ME. *ai*. *O.E.D.*, in quoting among other evidence Ray's Cheshire proverb, 'Rynt you, witch, quoth Bessie Locket to her mother', finds the local nature, the meaning, and the form of the phrase *Ryndta* 'all opposed to its identity with Shakespeare's *Aroynt*'. The Stratford evidence seems rather to suggest that Ray's proverb merits consideration as offering, in local speech, a form of the word which is phonetically acceptable, in precisely that collocation elsewhere attested. *Overlook* of the Stratford record, in the sense 'to look upon with the "evil eye"; to bewitch' is cited first by *O.E.D.* from *Merchant of Venice* (III. ii. 15, 'Beshrow your eyes, They haue ore-lookt me and deuided me'), and from *Merry Wives* (v. v. 87, 'Vilde worme, thou wast ore-look'd euen in thy birth'), with the next citation not until 1697. Is this another instance of speech-usage insufficiently evidenced in the printed record, first registered through the accident that it forms part

¹ For 'collocation' see J. R. Firth, 'Modes of Meaning', *Essays and Studies* (1951). My debt to Professor Firth will then be apparent.

² For 'diaphonic overlap' see D. Jones, *The Phoneme: Its Nature and Use* (Cambridge, 1950), §§ 610-14.

of the text of a much-studied dramatist? *Ill-looking* of the Stratford record suggests 'having the power to look upon with the evil eye', a sense not attested in Shakespeare's text or in other literary sources and not included by *O.E.D.* The narrow scope of present investigations forbids the positive conclusion that forms, senses, collocations, first registered by *O.E.D.* from Shakespeare's text, and found equally in Stratford records of Shakespeare's time, are to be characterized as Stratford 'dialect'. It is clear, however, that elements of vocabulary uniquely or rarely recorded in the literary text may show themselves fast-rooted in the spoken language.

A further instance will illustrate the problem. *Skaines mates* is found, so far, once only, when Juliet's nurse is abusing Mercutio to Romeo and Peter, in speech as lively and up to the minute as that in which poor 'goodie bromlie' is attacked by her Stratford enemies. *O.E.D.* confesses that the origin and exact meaning of the word is uncertain. It is not an expression that keeps the best of company:

scruie knaue, I am none of his flurt-gils, I am none of his skaines mates, and thou must stand by too and suffer euery knaue to vse me at his pleasure. [answered by Peter] I saw no man vse you at his pleasure: if I had, my weapon should quickly haue bene out. (II. iv. 162.)

From the build and emphasis of the Nurse's sentence—syntax, prosody, and collocation—we should expect *skaines mates* to be closely related in sense to *flurt-gils*, a compound first found here, but attested by *O.E.D.* within similar range of collocation (1613, 'You heard him take me vp like a f., and sing baudi songs upon me'; 1618, 'As I had been a Mawkin, a flurt Gillian').¹ Older-style commentators, regarding the single word as the unit of meaning, have proposed interpretations based on *skene*, 'a knife or dagger' (to which Peter's *weapon*, in one sense, is, no doubt, a punning reference), or on 'skein of thread': loose companions who frequent the fencing school, cut-throat companions, swaggering fellows; milliner-girls, winders of skeins looked upon as the lowest kind of people among the weavers in Spitalfields. Of these only 'milliner-girls' is in suitable semantic relation to *flurt-gils*, and lexical evidence suggests that 'milliner' took on the necessary suggestiveness long after Shakespeare's time. If we are prepared to concede that the single instance in the dramatic text may indicate firmly grounded colloquial usage, we can do better. *O.E.D.* shows the verb *skent* 'to entertain, amuse', last recorded for *a.* 1250, citing, as one instance of the verbal substantive, from *Lazamon's Brut* (dated *c.* 1205), where tidings come to Uther in Tintagel that Gorlois is slain: 'pis iherde þe king þær he læi an skentting' (l. 19167). Continuing the citation beyond

¹ *O.E.D.*: *Flirt* *sb.* 5. A woman of a giddy, flighty character ... 1562-1775. b. A woman of loose character. 1600-1703.

wh
unl
ma
tex
ma
der
wo
pos
con
wel
wer
len
pos
for
ans
from
be g
whi
liter
in c
afte
by
acco
imp
I ca
F
been
not
cont
diffe

1 s
M.L.
2 J
prin
Shre
[sayin
Ca
distri
Of
are v
geven
stitut
was f
Mi
1554:

what *O.E.D.* gives, ' & leap ut of bure', and defining Lazamon's sense with unbowlerized contextual precision, we can see Shakespeare's *skaines mates* exactly parallel to *flurt-gils*, in a sense fully apposite to verbal context and dramatic situation. On the formal level of written language it may seem that there are difficulties in regarding *skaines* as a noun-derivative of *skent* (ON. *skemta*), since the *t* is an essential part of the word. But a dramatic text is primarily something spoken, and the juxtapositional elisions of ordinary present-day speech, which give us such compounds as *krismas* (Christmas) and *blain mæn* (blind man), are, of course, well-evidenced also in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writings: *hansom*, *wensday*, *wascode*, *paseboard*, *hunsman*; the *ai* perhaps indicates a dialectal lengthening of ME. *e*. Again it may be objected that I have no right to postulate that even the least respectable of words may live on in speech for as much as three centuries after its last recording in writing. The answer to this lies in a study of the unregistered vocabulary to be abstracted from unpublished local records. A full description of these sources cannot be given here.¹ Suffice it to say that there exists an abundance of material, which, in some ways, comes nearer to the reality of speech than more literary texts. Such non-literary records frequently show a word or sense in currency a hundred years (sometimes 300 years) before the first, or after the last, citation of it by *O.E.D.* Further, the localizations suggested by *O.E.D.* are necessarily tentative only. A few instances from parish accounts are given below to show the kind of evidence available; what is impressive, however, is the amount of the evidence to be found, and that I cannot illustrate.²

Further examples from the dramatic text will reinforce what has already been suggested, that the 'unit' from which meaning is to be abstracted is not the word in isolation, and that, according as the 'text' is extended or contracted, so the meaning of the word in the text may shift into quite different ranges.

¹ See Hilda Hulme, 'Manuscript Material for the study of Tudor and Stuart English', *M.L.R.* xli (1946), 108-12.

² *Blade*, in sense 10 a, is cited by *O.E.D.* from *Dictionary of Architecture*, 1851, 'the principal rafter of a roof', and from *Shropshire Gloss*. 1879. The records of the Abbey, Shrewsbury, 1577, have *a pyce of tymber to make a blode for the yle, in saying the blade [saying 'sawing']*.

Care Sunday is cited by *O.E.D.* as Scottish, from 1536; *E.D.D.* shows it more widely distributed. The records of Walsall, Staffs., have *Kare Sunday* 1482.

Of *Chalk*, in the sense 'lime', *O.E.D.* says: 'Traces of this sense after the OE. period are very uncertain; quot. 1572 is doubtful.' In the records of Oswestry, 1583, is found *geven for [chalkes] lyme*; there are four instances of this deletion of *chalk* with the substitution of *lyme*, evidence that *chalk* was still used in speech in this sense, although it was felt that *lime* was more correct.

Minging 'memorial' is last cited by *O.E.D.* in 1250. It is found at St. Nicholas, Warwick, 1554: *resevyd . . . for the grett bell at hys Wyffs yere mynggyng*.

Sometimes it is the speaker's pleasure to link two current senses by the overlap of two 'units':

shee told mee, not thinking I had beene my selfe, that I was the Princes Iester, and that I was duller then a great thaw, hudling iest vpon iest, with such impossible conueiance vpon me, that I stood like a man at a marke, with a whole army shooting at me. (*Much Ado*, II. i. 253.)

No doubt a contemporary audience, accustomed to such verbal dexterity, would easily pick up the two senses of *conveyance*; those glossarists I have consulted stop short at one, reading the word in incomplete citation as given, for example, in Bartlett's *Concordance*, 'Huddling jest upon jest with such impossible conveyance upon me', and explaining as 'sleight of hand, jugglery, manual or mental adroitness'. If the citation is extended to 'with such impossible conveyance upon me that I stood like a man at a mark, with a whole army shooting at me', the concrete sense 'carriage of shot' is also required, a sense previously unregistered for the noun *conveyance*, although indicated by *O.E.D.*'s seventeenth-century citations for the verb.¹

Humour of overlapping units of meaning may be consciously contrived by the speaker; it may also be found unemphatically contrived by the dramatist so as not to be perceived by the speaker. Falstaff's selecting of Mouldy for military service affords the instance *prickt*:

Fal. Is thy name Mouldie?

Moul. Yea, if it please you.

Fal. 'Tis the more time thou wert vs'd.

Shal. Ha, ha, ha, most excellent. Things that are mouldie, lacke vse: very singular good. Well saide Sir *Iohn*, very well said.

Fal. Pricke him.

Moul. I was prickt well enough before, if you could haue let me alone: . . .

Fal. Go too: peace Mouldie, you shall goe. Mouldie, it is time you were spent.
(2 *Hen. IV*, III. ii. 121.)

It is probable that Mouldy's *prickt*, as he intends it, plays back to the bawdy suggestiveness he hears in Shallow's *use*. The second sense of the word lies in Shakespeare's humour, not in Mouldy's. Falstaff's words reiterate the clue, and part of the point of the joke is that Mouldy himself does not perceive the congruity of a man with his name claiming to be sufficiently 'turned sour'. Although the adjective *pricked* is not registered, in this sense, by *O.E.D.* until 1678, other verbal forms are found from 1594.²

Where a word-meaning, satisfactory on one level, is clear from the

¹ *Convey* v. 4. b. To project to a distance, to 'carry' (a shot, &c.). *Obs.* 1634, 1660.

² 8. *intr.* Of wine, beer, &c.: To become or begin to be sour.

immediate context, it may happen that internal linguistic evidence, as well as dramatic propriety, requires an additional sense to be derived from a greatly extended context. Falstaff, defending his choice of pressed-men, and letting Mouldy and Bullcalf escape service, says of Wart:

Come, manage me your Calyuer: so: very well, go-too, very good, exceeding good. O, giue me alwayes a little, leane, old, chopt, bald Shot. (2 *Hen. IV*, III. ii. 295.)

Johnson noted here: '*Shot* is used for *shooter*, one who is to fight by shooting', and *O.E.D.* has, with this citation from the play, 'A soldier armed with a firearm'. This single meaning is insufficient on prosodic grounds, for each additional preceding adjective in Falstaff's sentence increases our expectation of double meaning in the noun-climax. The dramatic situation points to the appropriate second sense, a figurative use of *O.E.D.*'s *Shot* sb.3, . . . 'a refuse animal left after the best of the flock or herd have been selected'. Although *O.E.D.*'s earliest citation for this noun is from a report of 1796, the wide use of the term in present-day dialect in sheep-farming counties and the long history of the verb *shoot* in a similar although less restricted sense,¹ would make it likely that the life of the noun in spoken English has been longer than the direct written evidence shows.

The meaning of a word is sometimes to be established both by a study of the general situations in which it had currency, and also by the individual situations and responses peculiar to the speaker who employs it. An instance of this is *pie*d (*Tempest*, III. ii. 71):

Ariell. Thou liest, thou canst not.

Cal. What a py'de Ninnie's this? Thou scuruy patch:

I do beseech thy Greatnesse giue him blowes.

Johnson would give *What a py'de Ninnie's this* to Stephano, since *pie*d *ninny* alludes to the striped coat worn by fools, of which Caliban could have no knowledge. Other editors leave the speech to Caliban, taking *pie*d in the same sense. But while this may be part of the sense the hearers received, it is not the main sense of the speaker, nor do those glossarists who offer it take account of the collocations of *pie* and its compounds in the language of Shakespeare's contemporaries. Caliban's outburst comes when he has, as he thinks, been given the lie for the third time by Trinculo. At the second interruption *Thou lyest* (this time by Ariel) Caliban has turned on Trinculo with

Thou lyest, thou iesting Monkey thou:

I would my valiant Master would destroy thee.

I do not lye.

¹ 11. f. To shoot forth, out, away: to drive out . . . a. 1300 on.

The 'jesting monkeys' of Caliban's world of experience are the spirits ordered by Prospero to punish him,

Sometime like Apes, that moe and chatter at me,
And after bite me (II. ii. 9),

and it is to the mindless mischievous chattering of Trinculo that Caliban refers. Stephano threatens Trinculo, not for jesting at Caliban, but for interrupting him (*if you trouble him any more in's tale and Interrupt the Monster one word further*), and it is for Ariel's senseless-seeming repetition ('parrot-like' in our idiom) that Trinculo is beaten. *O.E.D.*'s citations show that one of the meanings of *pie* from the early fourteenth to the mid-nineteenth century is its habitual collocation with the verbs *chat*, *chatter*; a magpie is still a *chatter-pie* in many dialects. So *py'de Ninnie* is parallel to *jesting Monkey* (*pied*, 'chattering like a magpie'). Caliban's image is from the life he knows, and his indignation, as Johnson felt, comes from the immediate situation.

A further instance of this kind is offered by *trammel* (*Macbeth*, I. vii. 3):

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well,
It were done quickly: If th'Assassination
Could trammell vp the Consequence, and catch
With his surcease, Successe: that but this blow
Might be the be all, and the end all.

The earliest commentators on this passage explained the verb *trammel* from the noun senses. Dyce glosses: 'A trammel means both a kind of draw-net and a contrivance for teaching horses to pace or amble.' Strangely enough present-day glossarists follow the same path. *O.E.D.* cites this instance and defines: '*fig.* To entangle or fasten *up* as in a trammel', and Onions's glossary has, with this textual reference, 'lit. to entangle in a net; fig. to prevent'. These senses are perhaps part of the range of meaning received by Shakespeare's first audience. But it might well be argued that the essential poetic and dramatic significance of the verb in this text (and the 'text' here is most of the play) lies in its special application in Tudor English 'to bind up (a corpse)', for which *O.E.D.* cites three instances:

1536 . . . (Funeral Q. Kath.) The Corps must be sered, tramayled, leded and chested. 1546-7 . . . (Funeral K. Hen. VIII) Surely bound and trammel'd with cords of silk. c. 1558 . . . Whoo [Q. Mary] after her Departuer was . . . cered, and tramelled in this Manner.

And if this is so, then, through this image Macbeth betrays, before the deed, his unacknowledged awareness of that 'strange infirmity' he shares with all men, through which his human fear of mortal guilt expresses itself in the most primitive and terrible symbolism, the apparition of his

murdered king, untrammelled by the silken cords that bind the serecloth, 'come out on's graue'. Macbeth knows now, before the murder of Duncan, as he is to know again after the murder of Banquo, that the time has never been

That when the Braines were out, the man would dye,
And there an end.

Unbraided (*Winter's Tale*, iv. iv. 204) is to be interpreted on similar lines, by a consideration both of the word's collocations in current speech and of the dramatic context of the individual utterance.

Ser. He hath songs for man, or woman, of all sizes: No Milliner can so fit his customers with Gloues: he has the prettiest Loue-songs for Maids, so without bawdrie (which is strange,) with such delicate burthens of Dildo's and Fadings: Iump-her and thump-her; and where some stretch-mouth'd Rascall, would (as it were) meane mischeefe, and breake a fowle gap into the Matter, hee makes the maid to answere, *Whoop, doe me no harme good man*: put's him off, slights him, with *Whoop, doe mee no harme good man*.

Pol. This is a braue fellow.

Clo. Beleeue [*sic*] mee, thou talkest of an admirable conceited fellow, has he any vnbraided Wares?

Ser. Hee hath Ribbons of all the colours i'th'Raine-bow. . .

Clo. Pre'thee bring him in, and let him approach singing.

Perd. Forewarne him, that he vse no scurrilous words in's tunes.

Clow. You have of these Pedlers, that have more in them, then you'd thinke (Sister.)

To summarize some of the commentary as briefly as possible: the emendations *braided* and *embroided* have been proposed; the word has been taken in its literal sense to mean 'smooth and plain goods . . . not twisted into braids', 'not ornamented with braid', &c.; a later group of definitions, 'undamaged, unspoilt, unfaded, not counterfeit or adulterated', is arrived at by a consideration of three pieces of linguistic evidence—*braid* which appears to bear the sense 'deceitful' (*All's Well*, iv. ii. 73),¹ *Bailey's Dictionary* definition (1721), *braided* 'faded, lost its colour', and the collocation of *braided* with *ware* (as, for instance, in Middleton's *Anything for a Quiet Life*: 'she says you vent Ware that is not warrantable, brayded Ware and that you give not *London* measure'). In so far as the clown's question refers to the pedlar's haberdashery and is answered by the servant within the same range of meaning, these definitions of the second group are satisfactory, as is attested by the later words of the clown, 'Pedler

1

Since Frenchmen are so braide,
Marry that will, I liue and die a Maid:
Onely in this disguise, I think't no sinne,
To cosen him that would vniustly winne.

let's have the first choice'. But the clown's words, as well as being answerable by 'Ribbons of all the colours i'th'Raine-bow', are themselves in answer to the servant's description of the songs of Autolycus. The songs are the first interest of the clown, of Shakespeare and of the audience, 'Let's first see moe Ballads: Wee'l buy the other things anon'; the clown gladly buys, as we would gladly hear, the ballad of the Usurer's wife, and of the Fish who sang against the hard hearts of maids. The servant has praised the variety of the pedlar's songs, but he describes one kind only, the kind in which the clown, and some part of the audience, takes least interest, 'songs for Maids, so without bawdrie', in which the girl evades the scurrilous jests of her singing-partner, 'puts him off and slights him'. While admitting the wit of this kind of song, the clown would be fitted with a different glove. As Perdita well understands, he would have his love-songs 'without these adroit turns, tricks or subtleties',¹ and with country shrewdness, in phrasal form particularly relevant to dealings with a pedlar, he asks directly for what he wants.

Shakespeare in the above instance is using a phrase of fixed form with its current sense, but at the same time he isolates and emphasizes one of the elements of the phrase pattern, so that, from the personality of the speaker and from the dramatic situation, there flashes out also the unique sense which characterizes living language. The present-day reader can grasp two such senses at a glance, but the swiftness of perception of contemporary audiences is beyond him when the 'equivocators' are professionals (or Gentlemen players of more than professional skill) dexterously and dizzily piling one sense on another, emphasizing now this, now that, with all the resources of speech and pantomime. Commentary here hobbles slowly after, clogged by supporting evidence laboriously sought out. Creatures of habit as we are, there is then the danger that the delightful elaborations of a Touchstone, because they have not previously been studied in isolation, may be dismissed as the tedious over-elaborateness of a bedazed book-worm. What of *scrip and scrippage* (*As You Like It*, III. ii. 171)?

Cel. How now backe friends: Shepheard, go off a little: go with him sirrah.

Clo. Come Shepheard, let vs make an honorable retreat, though not with bagge and baggage, yet with scrip and scrippage.

After philosophical discussion with Corin of the shepherd's life, Touchstone has poured forth mockery on the love-verses found by Rosalind. Celia enters 'with a writing' and reads the verse she has. A number of editors and glossarists have supposed Touchstone, then dismissed from the scene by Celia, to find honour in retreat in the simple parallelism of

¹ *O.E.D.* **Braid** *sb.* 3. An adroit turn; a trick or subilty. . . . *Obs.*: to 1570.

scrip and scrippage with *bag and baggage*. This is to give him grounds for complaint that he is with us 'as the most capricious Poet honest *Ovid* was among the Gothes. . . . When a mans verses cannot be vnderstood, nor a mans good wit seconded with the forward childe, vnderstanding.' In the New Cambridge text *Touchstone* is credited with two additional quibbles: '*bag and baggage* No doubt intended as an unmannerly reference to *Rosalind and Celia*, while we give a meaning to "*scrip and scrippage*" if we suppose that *Touchstone* picks up *Celia's* paper and puts it into his scrip or wallet'. Thus *Touchstone's scrip* is also 'script', as in 'You were best to call them generally, man by man, according to the scrip' (*Midsummer Night's Dream*, I. ii. 3), and it is probable that he steals forward from his position as a back-friend to possess himself of 'a writing'. The 'wallet' and the 'writing' the audience can see, and the third sense of *scrip*, 'a scornful grimace, mock or jeer',¹ would be made no less plain. It would be possible too for *Touchstone*, in delivering the speech, to create, by pause and pantomime, a fourth sense, 'dismissal for a time' (often the jester's portion while the business of the play proceeds), in contradistinction to *bag*, 'the sack for good and all'.² So he bears away his wallet (the concrete sense), one of the writings (a homophone in common speech), his jesting (supposing *O.E.D.*'s location of the noun may be extended; that the verb is more frequently found shows the fortuitous selectiveness of the evidence). He goes only for a time (nonce-creation, following 'Go off a little', by the opposition of *scrip* to *bag*, if, in the spoken text, this latter is emphasized and, for an instant, isolated), and he goes without loss of face (by the common collocation of *bag* with *baggage*). A respectable but by no means unusual score.

Only those who agree that such analysis is valid should proceed to my last example, *pur* (*All's Well*, v. ii. 20), where the artistes are not acrobats but jugglers, tossing several senses into the air at once and changing the ranges of meaning within the interweaving patterns.

Par. Pray you sir deliuer me this paper.

Clo. Foh, prethee stand away: a paper from fortunes close-stoole, to giue to a Nobleman. Looke heere he comes himselfe.

Enter Lafew

Clo. Heere is a purre of Fortunes sir, or of Fortunes Cat, but not a Muscat, that ha's falne into the vnleane fish-pond of her displeasure, and as he sayes is muddied withall. Pray you sir, vse the Carpe as you may, for he lookes like a poore decayed, ingenious, foolish, rascally knaue. . . .

¹ *O.E.D. Scrip* sb.² *Sc. Obs.* A scornful grimace: 1470 only instance. v.² *Sc. Obs.* To mock, deride . . . scoff, jeer: c. 1450-1658.

² See *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*, under *Bag (Sack)*, *To give one the*, where the first instance of the sense 'dismiss' is in a sermon of 1629.

Par. My Lord I am a man whom fortune hath cruelly scratch'd.

Laf. And what would you haue me to doe? 'Tis too late to paire her nailes now. Wherein haue you played the knaue with fortune that she should scratch you, who of her selfe is a good Lady, and would not haue knaues thriue long vnder? There's a Cardecue for you:

Conjectural emendation would change *purre* to 'puss' here, omitting the second *of* before *Fortune*. Some who keep the original text have confessed to ignorance of the sense; others interpret *purre* as a 'murmur' or 'grumble', or 'like the purring of a sycophant cat, . . . calculated to procure favour and protection'. Schmidt glosses, with this reference, 'the low murmuring sound of a cat'; *O.E.D.* cites this passage as the first instance of that sense. But the clown is a thoroughly competent wit-snapper, and the opposition *a purre of Fortunes sir, or of Fortunes Cat* (with the pun on the homophone developed in his *muscat* quibble and returned to by Parolles and Lafew in *scratch'd* and *scratch*) suggests strongly that whatever the first *pur* is, it is not the usual purr of a cat. The *Carpe* and *fish-pond* imagery, with *Fish of Fortunes butt'ring* a few lines earlier, would make appropriate, as a secondary signification, the name of a fish, and we find in *E.D.D.* *purr*, 'a small codlin' (Shetlands, 1866). More intensive collecting of material might give us this word-sense in an earlier record nearer home. Further, the fish-pond image proceeds from and is part of the close-stool imagery of this and the immediately preceding passage:

Fortunes displeasure is but sluttish if it smell so strongly as thou speak'st of: I will hencefoorth eate no Fish of Fortunes butt'ring. Pre thee alow the winde.

Within the conventions of Elizabethan clownery we should perhaps expect therefore that *purre* would also bear a meaning or group of meanings having reference to this larger image; the sense 'excrement' would be contextually proper. How much of colloquial or vulgar vocabulary in the specialized field of sex and bodily function existed in speech only, even in less linguistically inhibited ages, we can only conjecture. Paucity of dictionary evidence is to be expected, and it may well be that forms that get into the written language of more recent times have taken on respectability through false etymology, analogical spelling, or restricted application. What evidence is available here, from *O.E.D.* and *E.D.D.*, suggests that a word of the shape of 'pur', with the sense 'dung', was dying out in the mid-nineteenth century.¹ Further ripples and cross-currents of allusion may proceed, as the clown is speaking, from *pure* 'a kept mistress', *cat* 'a prostitute', from *cat* suggesting *pussy* 'cunnus' (surviving into present-

¹ *O.E.D.* *Pure* sb. 5 . . . *Tanning*. Dogs' dung or other substance used as an alkaline lye for steeping hides. Also in *comb.* as *pure-collector*, *-finder*, *-finding*. (Also spelt *pewer*, *puer*) 1851, 1858. *E.D.D.* *Poor* . . . *poor-luck*, cat's dung, Lincs. 1866.

day spoken English, but not in any of the written sources of *O.E.D.*; there are cognates in other Germanic languages), and it is possible that Lafew's words *played the knave with Fortune* (cf. *Merchant of Venice*, II. iii. 12, and *All's Well*, IV. v. 24) throw back to *pur* additional senses, complementary on the male side, to the first and third of these.¹ 'Playing the knave' also links on to the third and main significance in which the clown uses the word, 'the knave or jack in the game of post and pair'. Evidence for this main sense, clear but not extensive, is found, once more, in *O.E.D.*² To Professor Dover Wilson belongs, it seems, the credit of first noting its relevance here. The fact that *pur* might be associated with *pur-dog* in extended collocation may have led to the emphasized opposition *or of Fortune's Cat*, and Lafew's *pare* may be another minor reference within the same card-game range. If these suggestions are correct, the clown's *pur* has significance in each of three concentric fields of imagery and Lafew picks up and plays back within the third range, that of 'knave'. And in this range the significance is not verbal only, but situational, dramatic. Parolles, in an earlier scene (II. iv), had addressed the clown as 'my knave' and the clown was then at some pains to exchange the term with him. Now the whirligig of time has brought its revenge, the clown may refer to Parolles as the knave of Fortune—if he is under the imputation of playing the knave with her, she has certainly played the knave with him; from the ambiguous *pur* the clown passes to the plain *knave*, echoed and re-echoed by Lafew as the scene continues.

I hope, by these few instances, to have shown that, for the interpretation of such forms of our earlier literature as are composed primarily in the spoken language, the evidence of *O.E.D.* may be supplemented both from without, from unsearched sources of regional English, and from within, through an awareness that the written record may give only a faint indication of strongly rooted spoken usage. Further, while a dictionary must present language artificially slowed-down, or held still, for the examining and defining of the word as the single-sense element, the language of drama is speech-in-action; given its natural momentum it readily forms and re-forms at an instant a variety of units of differing lengths, whirling on a meaning series at once concurrent and consecutive. The glossarist can demonstrate to what degree these units are matchable in contemporary speech and literature, and may suggest through what patterns of combination and superimposition the word has acquired, in the dramatic text,

¹ *O.E.D. Pur* *dial.* . . . [OE. in *pur lamb*, of uncertain origin]. a. A ram or wether lamb; also *pur-lamb*, *pur-hog*. b. *transf.* A male child, a boy: to 1888.

² *Pur*, *purr*. *Cards. Obs.* [Origin unascertained.] A name given to the knave or Jack in the game of post and pair. . . Also *attrib. pur-chop, pur-dog*, ? a card which would take the knave.

a total reference that is unique. It should be said finally that the reintegration that follows this analysis is the responsibility of the individual 'auditor'. It is unlikely that any two students of a single play will arrive at the same set of conclusions.¹

¹ In my researches into regional English of the Elizabethan period, and in my work on Shakespeare's language, I have been helped by a generous grant from the Central Research Fund of London University.

S
to o
It
bula
Lloy
unru
nour
wou
it d
of t
take
who
'Th
soph
has,
line
C
sligh
note
with
Aga
dark
ther
min
or th
soun

1 J
p. 45
i. 22
261-
pp. 1
pp. 2
3 c
4 J
5 J
6 c
7 c
8 c

R.

MARVELL'S 'THE DEFINITION OF LOVE'

By DENNIS DAVISON

SOURCES for phrases in Marvell's poem have been found in Horace, Cowley, Sidney, Massinger, Montague, and George Herbert.¹ I wish to offer further observations about some words and phrases.

It is often difficult to tell when Marvell is using stock images and vocabulary and when he is being startlingly original. Misses Bradbrook and Lloyd Thomas say that the title presents a paradox, since 'Love, the unruliest of the passions, is to receive a *definition*'. This was a new noun, the earliest known use of it being that of Milton in 1645: it would sound much more technical to a contemporary of Marvell than it does to us.² As a matter of fact the *O.E.D.* (under 4) lists the use of this noun in its geometrical sense as early as 1571. We must also take into account the fact that Crashaw described Hope as 'Thou by whom/ Our Nothing hath a definition'³ and Herrick entitled one poem 'The Definition of Beauty'.⁴ We are still left wondering, therefore, just how sophisticated or original Marvell's title would have seemed. Miss Tuve has, of course, shown that Marvell's poem was quite a latecomer in the long line of verse definitions of love.⁵

Commentary on the imagery used by Marvell to present Fate has been slight. How far are Marvell's images either original or precise? One must note that Crashaw's Fates also have a 'steely operation' and are associated with 'the Iron-pointed pen,/ That notes the Tragick Doomes of men.'⁶ Again, whereas Thomas Stanley's 'unrelenting Destinies' issue 'mystic dark decrees' Marvell's 'Tyrannick pow'r' employs 'Decrees of Steel' and thereby 'enviously debarrs'.⁷ What exactly is the image Marvell has in mind? Is it the (rather inappropriate) shears of Fate, the sword of a tyrant, or the bars of a prison or fence? For Herbert, in the poem where a Marvell source has been located, 'barres' seem to refer to a fence.⁸ The same word

¹ M. C. Bradbrook and M. G. Lloyd Thomas, *Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, 1940), p. 45, n. 1. H. M. Margoliouth, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (Oxford, 1927), i. 224. *R.E.S.*, o.s. xxiii (1947), 63-65, 267; N.S. ii (1951), 374-5; iii (1952), 375; iv (1953), 261-3. Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1945), pp. 162-3. Dennis Davison, *Andrew Marvell: Selected Poetry and Prose* (London, 1952), pp. 217-18.

² *Andrew Marvell*, p. 45.

³ 'On Hope' (1646) ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford, 1927), p. 143.

⁴ *Hesperides* (1648). *Works*, ed. Saintsbury (London, 1905), i. 42.

⁵ Rosemond Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (Chicago, 1947), p. 302.

⁶ 'Another', ed. Martin, p. 171.

⁷ 'Despair', 'Expectation'. Saintsbury's *Caroline Poets* (Oxford, 1905-21), iii. 101, 109.

⁸ 'The Search' (*The Temple*, 1633), st. 13.

crops up in a play about Platonic Love together with other phrases which are near to Marvell's:

... why should the lawes,
The Iron lawes of Ceremony, barre
Mutual embraces?¹

It would seem in fact that we cannot apprehend Marvell's image unless we determine what he meant by 'wedges' in the lines:

But Fate does Iron wedges drive,
And alwaies crouds it self betwixt.

Misses Bradbrook and Lloyd Thomas suggest that 'Iron wedges' recall Horace's 'saeva Necessitas . . . cuneos manu gestans aena': also that they 'are perhaps meant to be magnetic' and that 'there is almost a feeling of crucifixion'.² Mr. Christopher Hill thinks the image comes from industry.³ I believe that a stanza in Herbert's 'The Search' may have been Marvell's initial source:

When Thou dost turn, and wilt be neare,
What edge so keen,
What point so piercing can appeare
To come between?

If 'edge' and 'point' (both common substitutes for 'sword') suggested Marvell's 'wedges', this supports the notion that Marvell was thinking of some military instrument, and even that he was alluding to the civil war. But there are other possibilities. Spenser had used exactly the same phrase to describe unquiet thoughts or Care:

His name was *Care*; a blacksmith by his trade,
That neither day nor night, from working spared,
But to small purpose yron wedges made;
Those be vnquiet thoughts, that carefull minds inuade.⁴

After Spenser's equation of 'wedges' and 'vnquiet thoughts' Marvell's image of Fate driving iron wedges into his 'extended Soul' seems less bizarre than at first appears. Perhaps, after all, the wedge simply comes from tree-felling: this seems to be a frequent poetic figure.⁵

¹ Ford, *Love's Sacrifice* (pub. 1633), v. i. 5-7.

² *Andrew Marvell*, pp. 45-46. (Mr. S. Whiteley, a classical scholar I have consulted, believes that Horace is drawing on imagery from carpentry or plumbing.)

³ 'Society and Andrew Marvell', *Modern Quarterly*, iv (1946).

⁴ *Faerie Queene*, Bk. iv, canto v, st. xxxv. This, and the references in the following footnote, were supplied by Mr. Gustav Cross.

⁵ Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, 1. iii. 315 (Arden edn.). Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedie*, 11. i. 5. Marston, *Antonios Revenge*, 111. iii. (*Works*, ed. H. H. Wood, i. 115). See also *O.E.D.* under *Wedge* sb. 1.

The conceit about oblique and parallel lines has been traced to passages in Massinger and Sidney (see p. 141, n. 1). I have suggested a source in Herbert's 'The Search', in which the poet speaks of his distance from, and then his uniting with, God's will: the stanza expressing spiritual unity has already been quoted above, but the stanza which speaks of separation from God is relevant to Marvell's conceit:

Thy will such a strange distance is
As that to it
East and West touch, the poles do kisse,
And parallels meet.

Perhaps Herbert's rapid catalogue of three symbols of impossibility indicates that they are all stock images. Certainly, conceits referring to the meeting of parallel lines according to the laws of perspective do not seem uncommon. The Massinger source probably refers to perspective.¹ Ford has 'lines of differing method/ Meeting in one full centre of delight' and William Fairfax has 'Till both our souls into one spirit run,/ So several lines are in their centre one' (as well as a similar image taken from optics: 'As in the crystal centre of the sight,/ Two subtle beams make but one cone of light.')

The imagery of Marvell's celebrated seventh stanza has always been thought of as geometrical. I wish to raise doubts about this by suggesting that stanzas 5, 6, 7, and 8 are all in fact astrological-astronomical, and therefore also have a unity which has not before been realized.

First of all, I believe that the 'distant Poles' of stanza 5 are the celestial, not the terrestrial, poles. 'Loves whole World', which revolves about these poles, does not refer to the terrestrial globe (which Marvell calls the 'Earth' in the next stanza) but is Marvell's version of the fanciful theory or metaphor often employed by the poets of the Platonic Love cult. This metaphor claimed that the pure spirits of lovers soared to a special celestial sphere of love: as Carew put it, speaking of 'those heavenly bowers',

Yet let our boundless spirits meet,
And in loves spheare each other greet.³

The next stanza, with the conceit involving the planisphere, has always been taken to continue the image of the terrestrial poles and globe of the previous stanza: I would claim that it continues the image of the celestial

¹ *R.E.S.*, O.S. xxiii (1947), 267.

² Ford, *The Lover's Melancholy* (pub. 1629), I. i. 168-9. Fairfax, 'The Union' (printed with a reply by Stanley, in *Caroline Poets*, iii. 154-5).

³ 'To my Mistress in absence'. Rhodes Dunlap, in his edition of Carew's poems (Oxford, 1949), pp. 223-4, refers to passages in Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going beyond the Seas', Randolph's, 'A Platonick Elegie', and Montague's *The Shepherd's Paradise*, which express the same theory.

poles and sphere. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* the planispheric astrolabe of the seventeenth century was a flat, circular map of the stars, often with such accessories as lines and tables of use to astrologers, and magnetic compasses. Thus, if the 'giddy Heaven fall', the celestial 'World' (as distinct from the 'Earth') would become a planisphere and the celestial poles would coincide. At the same time, of course, this would cause, or be accompanied by, a convulsion in the earthly globe. The precise meaning of 'some new Convulsion' has not previously been recognized: Marvell is referring to the widely held theory of his day that the world had been created in harmoniously regular forms, and that some cataclysm had caused the present irregularity. Thomas Burnet's *Telluris Theoria Sacra* (1681) is perhaps the best-known exposition of this theory, but in another poem Marvell twice bases passages on it:

The World when first created sure
Was such a Table rase and pure . . .
'Tis not, what once it was, the *World*;
But a rude heap together hurl'd. . . .¹

Although the passage in Montague claimed as a source for the image of the planisphere deals with the notion of a flattening of the earthly globe, it does not employ the term 'planisphere'. Marvell probably took the suggestion of terrestrial polar coincidence from Montague but transformed it into a celestial image by the introduction of the technical term 'planisphere'.

I have shown that stanzas 5 and 6 are based on astrological-astronomical concepts: stanza 8 obviously is. I think that stanza 7, although it contains some geometrical notions connected with astronomy (which is, after all, celestial geometry), does not present a new and intruding conceit from the realm of Cartesian geometry, but draws still from the field of cosmic imagery. The terms 'lines', 'oblique', and 'angles', in:

As Lines so Loves *oblique* may well
Themselves in every Angle greet

all have specifically astrological-astronomical meanings, and the first two are found in a contemporary poet. The *O.E.D.* gives the following definitions. LINE (sb.² 10) 'A circle of the terrestrial or celestial sphere; e.g. *ecliptic, equinoctial, tropic line.*' OBLIQUE (a. 2.b) '*Oblique sphere*, the celestial or terrestrial sphere when its axis is oblique to the horizon of the place. . . . ANGLE (sb.² 7) 'A name given to the four astrological 'houses', at the cardinal points of the compass.'

Now, in Herrick's 'The Eye', the expression 'oblique lines' is found as an explicitly astrological-astronomical term:

¹ 'Upon Appleton House', vv. 445-6, 761-2.

Make me an heaven; and make me there
 Many a lesser and greater sphere.
 Make me the straight, and oblique lines;
 The Motions, Latitudes, and the Signs.

Furthermore, Marvell's next image of parallel lines may not come from geometry or perspective, but, more immediately, from astrology-astronomy. Drayton, in 'To the New Year', speaks of 'Those Paralels so euen,/ Drawne on the face of Heauen'. Parallel lines, in astrology-astronomy, refer especially to lines on the parallel sphere, 'the celestial or terrestrial sphere in that position or aspect in which the equator is parallel to the horizon, i.e. at either of the poles: distinguished from *oblique* and *right* sphere'.¹ In Marvell's poem the lovers have been placed at the poles: they are thus in parallel spheres. Their lines, i.e. circles on their respective parallel spheres, are therefore both parallel and infinite. Marvell then adds the Euclidian dogma that they 'can never meet'.

Since I have not at present access to works on astrology I cannot claim that my interpretation of the above lines makes astrological sense. 'Angle' may not refer to the cardinal houses or *anguli*. It may refer to the curvilinear angles formed by the crossing of circular lines on spheres. Even so, the conceit would remain basically astrological-astronomical and so the final four stanzas would form a logical sequence of related images. Astrology-astronomy is the most relevant source for images in a poem which employs the concepts of the Platonic Love cult.

The final stanza is obviously based on astrology-astronomy. The conceit belongs to the traditional idiom for describing star-crossed lovers, and play with technical terms is to be expected. Henry King has: 'And the conjunction of our lips/ Not kisses make, but an Eclipse.'² Cowley, in 'Friendship in Absence' (*Miscellanies*), says that the souls of lovers are 'Like loving *Stars* which oft combine,/ Yet not themselves their own *Conjunctions* know.' And in 'The Distance' (*The Mistress*) he expresses Marvell's notion of the opposition of the stars in this lengthier version:

In this our *Fortunes* equal prove
 To *Stars*, which govern them above;
 Our *Stars* which move for ever round,
 With the same *Distance* still betwixt them found.

I think that 'The Definition of Love' proves that a poet may accept

¹ O.E.D. under *Parallel* (A. 1. b).

² 'The Boyes answer to the Blackmoor.' Marvell, in a letter of 9 Aug. 1671, wrote: 'And, under that, your own good Genius, in Conjunction with your Brother here, will, I hope, tho at the Distance of *England* and *Persia*, in good Time operate extraordinary Effects; for the Magnetism of two Souls, rightly touched, works beyond all natural Limits.' (ed. Margoliouth, ii. 306).

fashionable themes and a current idiom and yet produce a poem which is essentially original. The theme of the alternation of Hope and Despair in the Lover was to be met frequently in Caroline verse.¹ For the poets of the Platonic Love cult Fate was particularly malevolent. This poem provides interesting testimony that Marvell was interested in this cult. His attitude no doubt had changed by the time he came to gibe at Parker with this mocking allusion to the cult: 'I do not hear, for all this, that he had ever practised upon the honour of the ladies, but that he preserved always the civility of a Platonick knight-errant.'²

¹ See Crashaw's 'On Hope'; Cowley's 'On Hope'; Stanley's 'Despair', 'Expostulation with Love in Despair', 'Expectation'; King's 'The Forlorn Hope'; Patrick Hannay's 'Sonnet V'; Drayton's 'Amour 37'.

² *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672), ed. Grosart, iii. 49.

DRYDEN, CORNEILLE, AND THE *ESSAY OF DRAMATIC POESY*

By JOHN M. ADEN

WHEN, in 1693, Dryden declared to the Earl of Dorset that at the time of his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* he 'was sailing in a vast ocean without other help than the pole-star of the Ancients, and the rules of the French stage amongst the Moderns', it may be supposed that he was conceding a little both to memory and to modesty. Neander, we know, was plentifully endowed with native wit. It does seem likely, though, that he composed that 'little discourse', as A. A. Tilley says, 'with a copy of the 1660 edition of Corneille's plays, which contain his *Examens* and *Discours*, by his side'.¹

That Dryden was indebted to Corneille for much of the matter of his essay he was himself the first to acknowledge.² Despite this fact, the exact nature of the indebtedness has served to occupy scholars ever since. Martin Clifford, in a celebrated observation, accused Dryden of having 'pilfered out of Monsieur Hedelin, Menardiere and Corneille, an Essay of Dramatic Poetry',³ and so initiated a long line of speculation and conjecture regarding Dryden's use of the French critic.⁴ So far no one seems to have approached the problem on the terms laid down, or at least implied, by Dryden himself. These terms are those of Dryden's method in the *Essay*, viz. 'a little discourse in dialogue', 'sustained by persons of several opinions, all of them left doubtful, to be determined by the readers in general . . .'.⁵ The implications of this logical structure, clearly announced by Dryden, have

¹ *C.H.E.L.*, viii. 428. Cf. A. W. Ward, *ibid.*, p. 26.

² See *A Defence of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* in *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker, i. 125. Dryden cites Corneille by name, or virtually so, eight times in the *Essay*: see Ker, i. 40, 41, 49, 64, 67, 68, 75, 87.

³ Quoted in Ker, i. 306.

⁴ Cf. A. F. B. Clark, *Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England* (Paris, 1925), pp. 241-2: 'Not only is this general influence of Corneille upon Dryden obvious, but in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* . . . there are detailed and acknowledged borrowings. . . . So Ker's statement . . . that all Dryden's critical writings on the drama take their origin in Corneille's influence is perfectly justified.' For estimates of Corneille's influence on the whole of Dryden's work, see Laura Johnson Wylie, *Studies in the Evolution of English Criticism* (1894), p. 16; Ker, *op. cit.* i. xix ff.; J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (1908), i. lxiii-lxiv; Margaret Sherwood, *Dryden's Dramatic Theory and Practice* (1914), p. 64; T. S. Eliot, *Dryden: Poet, Dramatist, and Critic* (1932), p. 55 and *passim*; T. C. Macaulay, 'French and English Drama in the Seventeenth Century: Some Contrasts and Parallels', *Essays and Studies*, xx (1935), p. 46; and D. Nichol Smith, *John Dryden* (1950), pp. 17-18.

⁵ Ker, i. 112, 124. In this place, Dryden reminds the reader of his words in 'The Epistle Dedicatory' of *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*: 'I will give your Lordship the relation of a dispute betwixt some of our wits . . . 'tis true, they differed in their opinions, as 'tis probable they would . . .' (Ker, i. 26-27).

generally been ignored, with the result that too often the sum of Dryden's borrowings from Corneille in the *Essay* has been taken for the sum of Corneille's effect upon him. It is the purpose of this paper to make an approach to the problem which would seem more consistent with the facts, one recognizing what Dryden calls 'the frame and composition of the work', that is, 'a dialogue sustained by persons of several opinions'. Such an approach assumes that in the *Essay* Dryden speaks in his own person only as Neander; that according to the rhetorical convention he has adopted, Crites, Eugenius, and Lisideius represent views of persons other than Dryden;¹ and that, hence, any conclusions as to Corneille's influence upon Dryden himself at this stage must take into account, not simply the borrowings in the *Essay*, but, what is more to the point, the borrower. In this way it should be possible to reach a more exact knowledge of Corneille's relation to this important corner-stone in Dryden's critical edifice, and to clarify a much neglected distinction between indebtedness and influence.

The method will be to review the relevant parts of the *Essay* and its companion piece, *A Defence of An Essay*, citing the sources in Corneille and making distinctions as to the character of the borrowings and the person of the borrower, with special reference to Neander. In order to bring the examination into intelligible context, the pertinent passages in Dryden will be paraphrased.

Crites is the first to make use of Corneille in the *Essay*, and his borrowings extend over several pages.² He declares that those rules which the French call *Les Trois Unités* were derived from Aristotle and Horace. The French, he says, restrict the time of dramatic action to twenty-four hours, or as near that as possible, the reason being to achieve verisimilitude.³ Each act should take up an equal amount of the imaginary time of the play and should, moreover, represent no more imaginary time than the actual time required to present it.⁴ The 'intervals and inequalities of time' may be supposed 'to fall out between the acts'. The ancients observed this rule by beginning their plays close to the climax and delivering the 'former part' by means of narrations.

As for place, it ought, Crites says, to be the same throughout, since that

¹ The viewpoints are not always mutually antagonistic, of course. Dryden (Neander) obviously takes sides with Eugenius, and minor concessions are made here and there among the four. On the whole, however, Dryden is at odds with Crites and Lisideius.

² Beginning Ker, i. 38, l. 28 and extending to 41, l. 23.

³ 'Discours des Trois Unités', in *Œuvres de P. Corneille*, ed. Ch. Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1862-8), i. 111-12 and 113. If these passages were in Crites's mind, they were clearly not taken over *in toto*. Corneille expresses an ideal of perfect correspondence between imaginary and real time which Crites does not mention. Dryden in the *Defence of An Essay* expressly excludes the possibility of such a correspondence. See Ker, i. 129.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 114. But see p. 107, where Corneille prescribes a longer last act and a shorter first act. Crites either overlooked or ignored this.

is verisimilar. The latitude of an entire town or city may be allowed, however.¹ The French are especially careful in the observance of unity of place, never changing a scene in mid-act, but always keeping the scene identical and the stage constantly occupied. This Corneille calls *la liaison des scènes*.²

The action ought to be 'one great and complete', to which all subordinate parts of the play are 'subservient'. He cites Jonson, and then concludes this part of his presentation with a fairly close translation of Corneille.³

Obviously, Crites has helped himself liberally to Corneille, borrowing a description of the unities pretty much within the framework of pseudo-Aristotelian commonplace, and with it a point of view similar to, though hardly identical with, Corneille's. Since the unities constitute the one 'polemic motive' occupying all of the four debaters, it will be convenient to trace that aspect of the *Essay* through each of them.

Eugenius's account is likewise indebted to Corneille.⁴ He denies that the unity of place was a rule of the ancients, for, he says, it is to be found neither in Aristotle nor in Horace,⁵ nor in any until the French. Even Terence neglected time (here he cites Scaliger), and Euripides, in tying himself to one day, committed the absurdity of making Theseus go from Athens to Thebes, about forty miles, fight a battle, and appear victorious in the next act, all in the space of thirty-six verses, hardly a mile a verse. Terence is guilty of a similar fault. '*C'est bien employer un temps si court*, says the French poet, who furnished me with one of the observations. . . .'⁶ It is true the ancients have kept *liaison* better, 'but the reason is, because they have seldom above two or three scenes . . . in every act . . .'. Even though their plots were narrow, their persons few, and one of their acts hardly equivalent to one of our healthy scenes, they were still deficient, as witness Terence, where in the *Eunuch* Antipho enters single in the middle of the third act, after Cremes and Pythias have gone off.⁷

Eugenius has been equally generous with Corneille's wares, but it is noteworthy that he has so far borrowed no doctrine, only certain literary information and illustration: that neither Aristotle nor Horace prescribed unity of place, that Euripides violated it in the *Suppliants*, and that the

¹ Ibid., p. 119. Crites is less precise than Corneille. Dryden in the *Defence* specifically allows not only the latitude of the same town, but of 'places adjacent to each other in the same country'.

² Ibid., pp. 101, 109, 120.

³ Ker, i. 41 and *Œuvres*, i. 99.

⁴ Ker, i. 48-49.

⁵ Though Eugenius might have discovered it for himself, Corneille probably supplied him with this information; see *Œuvres*, i. 117.

⁶ Eugenius almost translates the Euripidean illustration; see *Œuvres*, i. 112. Dryden's wit supplied Eugenius with the 'not for every mile a verse'.

⁷ Ker, i. 101-2.

ancients were able to observe liaison better because of the fewness of their scenes.

The question of the unities is resumed in his turn by Lisideius, who, for the most part, employs *loci* in Corneille already used by Crites and Eugenius. In addition, Lisideius praises the French care of entrances and exits as part of their liaison which renders 'all the events in the play more natural; for there you see the probability of every accident, in the cause that produced it . . .'. And he quotes Corneille in support: 'for there is nothing so absurd, says Corneille, as for an actor to leave the stage, only because he has no more to say'.¹

Finally Neander, who is the key figure, considers the unities. He wonders what Lisideius will say if the French themselves acknowledge the rules too burdensome: 'I will allege Corneille's words, as I find them in the end of his Discourse of the Three Unities:—*Il est facile aux speculatifs d'estre severes, etc . . .*'. And he goes on to translate Corneille to the effect that experience might alter the attitude of these critics.² What he says next, though familiar, deserves quoting in order to get Neander's viewpoint in sharp relief:

by their servile observations of the Unities of Time and Place, and integrity of scenes, they have brought on themselves that dearth of plot, and narrowness of imagination, which may be observed in all their plays . . . by tying themselves strictly to the Unity of Place, and unbroken scenes, they are forced many times to omit some beauties which cannot be shown where the act began; but might, if the scene were interrupted, and the stage cleared for the persons to enter in another place. . . .³

Neander had, of course, prefaced his speech with certain concessions to Lisideius, but it is important to observe that not one of them is without reservation. He acknowledges 'that the French contrive their plots more regularly', he denies not 'but he has taxed us justly in some irregularities of ours', he grants that 'Lisideius has reason to tax . . . want of due connexion' in the subordinate actions of a play; but at the same time he is 'of opinion that neither our faults nor their virtues are considerable enough to place them above us', and, as for *tragi-comedy*, he will not 'with Lisideius, condemn the thing'. These concessions, qualified as they are, can hardly be regarded as acquiescences in principle to the French viewpoint expressed by Lisideius. It would be absurd to argue that Dryden (Neander) had no respect for the rules of the theatre, even at this vigorously independent period of his career, but his argument everywhere makes it unmistakable

¹ Ker, i. 67; *Œuvres*, i. 108.

² *Œuvres*, i. 122.

³ Ker, i. 76. Corneille had admitted this inconvenience (*Œuvres*, i. 114). Dryden's remarks immediately following ('if the act begins in a chamber . . .') recall Corneille's confession of that difficulty in connexion with *Rodogune* and *Heraclius* (pp. 118–19).

that he will dispose of his hand and heart as his conscience finally dictates, and that he has no intention of submitting even to the timid example of Corneille.

Neander, unlike his companions, borrowed only those parts of Corneille which are antagonistic to the unities and to *liaison*. From this evidence and that of his hostile tone, it would appear that Neander (Dryden) did not at this time accept the unities as canonical. Since Corneille also chafed under the rules, the question naturally arises whether he did not influence Dryden in a negative sense. Superficially it is a tempting speculation. Actually, however, it seems unlikely. Although Corneille found the unities troublesome, he never seriously questioned their legitimacy; his attitude is characterized by resignation rather than rebellion. Dryden on the contrary is at this stage at least openly hostile to the unities, vigorously and unequivocally resisting them: 'Now what, I beseech you, is more easy than to write a regular French play, or more difficult than to write an irregular English one, like those of Fletcher, or of Shakespeare?' The safest assumption would seem to be, not that Dryden was influenced by Corneille to take a stand against the unities, but that he took advantage of Corneille's complaints to invoke an 'authority' for a disposition he already possessed.

The case is altered in the *Defence of An Essay*, published later in the same year, but it is more subtle than a simple about-face. Sir Robert Howard in the Preface to *The Duke of Lerma* had attacked the unities on the grounds that they are essentially impossible of achievement with verisimilitude. Dryden now defends them against Howard's attack, but he does so not on the grounds of tradition or authority, but on those of reason, differentiating between real time and real place and imaginary time and imaginary place.¹ His whole argument, a fine specimen of logic and philosophical speculation, is original, owing nothing to Corneille or to anyone else. By now, to be sure, he has accepted Corneille's unities as *faits accomplis*; but at the same time, and this is important, he has almost wholly naturalized them, not only supplying an exposition of them essentially his own, but defending them from criticism Corneille never heard of.

Towards the conclusion of the *Defence*, Dryden alludes to the discussion in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*:

I say not this with the least design of limiting the stage too servilely to twenty-four hours. . . . In my Dialogue . . . several persons maintained their several opinions: one of them, indeed, who supported the cause of the French Poesy, said how strict they were in that particular; but he who answered, in behalf of our nation, was willing to give more latitude to the rule, and cites the words of Corneille himself, complaining against the severity of it . . . my own opinion is this . . . that the imaginary time of every play ought to be contrived into as narrow a compass, as the nature of the plot, the quality of the persons, and variety

¹ Ker, i. 125-8.

of accidents will allow. In Comedy, I would not exceed twenty-four or thirty hours; for the plot, accidents, and persons, of Comedy are small . . . but in Tragedy, the design is weighty, and the persons great; therefore, there will naturally be required a greater space of time in which to move them.¹

Here Dryden plainly feels the pressure of Corneille's submission to the Renaissance demand for a precisely defined unity of time, though he arms himself more liberally against it than Corneille was capable of doing. By this time the weight of Corneille's example has asserted an influence on Dryden's judgement, but it is important to recognize that it is a limited influence, one modified by Dryden's earlier independence and assimilated into a new rationale of his own. If Corneille influenced Dryden with respect to the unities, he would seem to have done so only to the extent of furnishing him with the tradition and providing him with an authority for his own natural disposition to resist it. Once having accepted them, Dryden worked out his own philosophy of their use.

We may now resume the survey of material derived from Corneille in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. This takes us back to Eugenius's argument in behalf of the moderns. After maintaining the doctrine of progress in the arts, Eugenius reminds his auditors that the Greeks did not even know the division of drama into acts, or if they did, 'it is yet so darkly delivered to us that we cannot make it out. All we know of it is, from the singing of their Chorus; and that too is so uncertain, that in some of their plays we have reason to conjecture they sung more than five times.'²

Eugenius's observation that 'the Spaniards at this day allow but three acts, which they call *jornadas*, to a play, and the Italians in many of theirs follow them' is also taken from Corneille.³ He seems similarly indebted for his observation that among the ancients 'instead of punishing vice and rewarding virtue . . . [they] have often shown a prosperous wickedness, and an unhappy piety; they have set before us a bloody image of revenge in Medea . . .'.⁴

Here, as before, Eugenius uses Corneille only for literary history: the Greek practice in act division, the Spanish practice, and the disregard of poetic justice among the ancients.

¹ Ker, i. 130-1. The references to Corneille in the first part of the quotation have been identified. In the latter part, where Dryden speaks of the difference in the application of time to comedy and to tragedy, he seems to be using Corneille again: see *Œuvres*, i. 96-97.

² *Ibid.*, p. 110, also p. 107.

³ Ker, i. 46; *Œuvres*, i. 107.

⁴ Ker, i. 46; *Œuvres*, i. 20. Amanda M. Ellis, 'Horace's Influence on Dryden', *P.Q.*, iv (1925), 39-60, ought to be mentioned here in connexion with an erroneous attribution, viz. that Eugenius's observation (Ker, i. 51) beginning 'For Horace himself . . .' and including the quotation (*Multa renascentur . . .*) was 'received direct from Corneille's first Discours' (p. 46, n. 29). Neither the statement nor the quotation is to be found there, or in any of the *Discours*.

Lisideius would be expected to borrow rather heavily from Corneille.¹ He seems to have derived from him his observations on the 'protatick persons in the Ancients', who hear and give the relations, a practice avoided by the French, who give their narrations only through persons 'interested in the main design'.²

Lisideius's whole discussion of narrations seems certainly indebted to Corneille. Lisideius explains to the company that there are two sorts of narrations: one of things antecedent to the play and related to enlighten the audience, the other of things which happen in the play but which occur off-stage. The first he considers faulty because they are seldom listened to by the audience and hence cause a subsequent confusion.³ The second type is a convenience, because it enables the avoidance of tumult on the stage.⁴ Neither does it fail to arouse 'concernment' in the audience; only the first sort, 'made often in cold blood . . . to the audience', fails in that respect.⁵

Lisideius replies to the objection that if some parts of the action may be represented, then why not all parts, by resorting to Corneille, translating him rather closely to the effect 'that the poet is not obliged to expose to view all particular actions', &c.⁶

In the matter of narrations or decorum, then, it is apparent that Lisideius is heavily indebted to Corneille. That this debt cannot be translated as influence on Dryden, however, will become clear when Neander's views are examined. But Lisideius borrows once more from Corneille, where he praises the French for avoiding 'simple change of will' in the ending of their plays.⁷

Neander's references to Corneille are considerably fewer than those of the other disputants. The first is a factual borrowing, almost a translation, relative to Corneille's practice in plotting comedy.⁸ Neander is here not embracing Corneille's type of comic plot, but simply illustrating the lack of portrayal of humours in French drama.

¹ Pierre Legouis ('Corneille and Dryden as Dramatic Critics', *Seventeenth-Century Studies Presented to Sir Herbert Grierson* (1938), p. 283) traces Lisideius's remarks that Shakespeare's plays are reprehensible as being 'so many chronicles of kings', &c. (Ker, i. 59), to that passage in the 'Troisième Discours' which has been cited above (p. 148, n. 3) as a possible source of Crites's observations on the unity of time. In its relation to Crites's remarks certain significant divergences were noted. In the present instance, except for the general drift of Lisideius's remarks—the time element—there is no discernible connexion. Topical similarity alone is insufficient evidence of contact.

² Ker, i. 61–62; *Œuvres*, i. 46. Although Dryden could have got the idea from Scaliger (see Ker, i. 298, note to p. 61, l. 34), its mention in connexion with the French practices, and the closeness of the idea-parallel, make it more likely that Corneille was the source.

³ His remarks in this place are just short of a translation of a passage in the 'Troisième Discours' (*Œuvres*, i. 104–5).

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 78.

⁵ Cf. Lisideius's remarks, especially his 'cold blood' with a quite similar observation in 'Examen de Rodogune', *ibid.*, iv. 423–4; and i. 105.

⁶ Ker, i. 64; *Œuvres*, i. 100.

⁷ Ker, i. 66; *Œuvres*, i. 105.

⁸ Ker, i. 68; *Œuvres*, i. 30.

Neander's observations on stage decorum take their departure from those of Lisideius, and hence involve Corneille. Neander acknowledges that it is reasonable to avoid tumult on the stage and to deliver any account of it by narrations; indeed, he agrees that all incredible actions should be removed from the stage, but at the same time he realistically declares that his countrymen will not suffer spectacle and horror to be withdrawn:

And indeed, the indecency of tumults is all which can be objected against fighting: for why may not our imagination as well suffer itself to be deluded with the probability of it, as with any other thing in the play?

At least two factors make it unnecessary to impute to Corneille any responsibility for Neander's position in this matter of stage decorum. In the first place, the idea of keeping the incredible off the stage was a Horatian commonplace with which Dryden was unquestionably long familiar. Secondly, as the quotation above shows, Neander is unwilling to subscribe wholly to the idea anyway, summoning his personal convictions against it. Neander takes an independent position here analogous to that taken by Dryden on the unities in the *Defence*; he examines the rule in the light of his own common sense and subjects it to a logical re-valuation. Neither the method nor the result is Cornelian.

Neander's 'Examen of *The Silent Woman*' seems to complicate matters, raising a question as to the consistency of Neander's position. But before taking up that question, we may note two minor borrowings in the *Examen*. Neander praises Jonson's art in that 'which Corneille has laid down as the greatest' advantage which can come to a play, 'the making choice of some signal and long-expected day, whereon the action of the play is to depend'.¹ The second borrowing is Neander's observation of the heightening of the action in each act of Jonson's play.²

In the use of the *Examen* itself, as a means of displaying Jonson's *Silent Woman*, Neander was, of course, borrowing a device from Corneille. That fact need not, however, lead to the inference exemplified in Margaret Sherwood's remark:

It would seem that Neander is advancing a standard different from that of Crites and Lisideius, but this is apparently not the case. He condemns the French for too close following of the rules, yet Jonson's *Silent Woman* is praised for being regular according to the strictest code, and one of the last proofs of the superiority of the English drama is stated thus: 'We have many plays of ours as regular as any of theirs.'³

The last part of Miss Sherwood's observation omits some peculiarly significant clauses immediately following in Dryden's context:

¹ Ker, i. 87; *Œuvres*, i. 116.

² Ker, i. 88; 'Examen de Rodogune', *Œuvres*, iv. 421.

³ Sherwood, op. cit., p. 26.

and which [Dryden continues], besides, have more variety of plot and characters; and secondly, that in most of the irregular plays of Shakespeare or Fletcher (for Ben Jonson's are for the most part regular) there is a more masculine fancy and greater spirit in the writing, than there is in any of the French.¹

It is not necessary to suppose either that because Neander examines *The Silent Woman* 'according to those rules which the French observe', he thereby abandons all that he has said or maintained before and surrenders himself to the French rules. His purpose in the *Examen* seems to be no more than to show that, if regularity must be the criterion, the English are not lacking in examples as accomplished as the French; that, in other words, the English are capable of beating the French even at their own game. The manner in which he qualifies his remark on the regularity of English drama and his assertion of the superiority of English drama in masculine fancy and spirit indicate that his loyalty has not suddenly been displaced. It should not be forgotten that Neander confesses that though he admires Jonson, he loves Shakespeare. The resort to Jonson is simply Neander's way of reminding his opponents that England is not without correct poets, or, for that matter, 'as many and profitable rules . . . as any wherewith the French can furnish us', in Jonson's *Discoveries*. If further proof is needed, there is the *au lecteur* prefixed to the *Essay*: 'The drift of the ensuing Discourse was chiefly to vindicate the honour of our English writers, from the censure of those who unjustly prefer the French before them.'² Neander (Dryden) has borrowed the plan of an *examen* (itself modified in the borrowing);³ he has not in doing so acquiesced in Corneille's doctrine.

What has made it difficult to perceive the real relation of Corneille to the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* is the same factor, apparently, that has made it tempting to infer a pervasive influence, and that is the form of the essay, with its four participants and its 'several opinions'. If, instead of overlooking it, we bear this scheme in mind, it should be possible to arrive at conclusions compatible with the circumstances.

The most obvious contribution of Corneille to the *Essay* is, in respect to influence, the least significant he could have made, a contribution of commonplaces and miscellaneous fragments of dramatic history, contemporary French practices, and dramatic techniques. Dryden sent the participants in the debate to Corneille to get data: the nature of the unities and *liaison*, the practice of the ancients and the French in regard to these and related matters, the theory and uses of narrations, act division in Greek,

¹ Ker, i. 78-79.

² Cf. also the comments toward the end of the *Examen*, pp. 88-89. In the *Defence* Dryden repeats the statement opening the 'To the Reader' (p. 125).

³ Note, for example, the lengthy digression on humours. Dryden, in borrowing the *examen* form, has lent it infinite variety unknown to Corneille.

Spanish, and Italian drama, the what and wherefore of protatic persons—the stock in trade of critical disquisition on the stage, the *materia dramatica* of past and present. Dryden himself, as Neander, borrowed from Corneille the idea of an *examen*, which he incorporated into the *Essay*.¹ To the extent of these various borrowings Dryden is clearly and rather extensively indebted to Corneille. But indebtedness is not necessarily the equivalent of influence. For the influence, moreover, it is necessary to look to Neander, since he alone reflects Dryden's personal convictions.

Neander borrowed from Corneille the following: a statement of Corneille's idea of the comic plot, a statement of the difficulties imposed on the playwright by the mechanic rules, some observations on the absurdities produced by observing *liaison*, a statement of the advantage of choosing a signal day on which to begin the action of a play, possibly an observation on the art of making a play rise in each act, and the *examen* device. Of these the first is a simple allusion to Corneille's own practice, and the last three pertain to the mechanics of playwriting and criticism; they exhibit no doctrinal significance. In terms of his borrowing, then, it is difficult to discern any influence of Corneille upon Neander unless it is to be found in his sympathy with Corneille's resistance to the rules. Even there, however, it was found difficult to suppose with any certainty Corneille's influence, for Dryden everywhere exceeds the liberties begged by Corneille and shows a capacity for acting independently of Corneille's more cautious example. In the *Defence of an Essay* Dryden had adopted the unities that Neander earlier resisted, but he enlarged their scope and paid no heed to Corneille's particular interpretation of them.²

¹ The form of the *Essay* itself owes nothing to Corneille. Dryden himself tells us the source of his form (*Defence of An Essay*, Ker, i. 124). It is perhaps unnecessary to add that Corneille never wrote anything similar in form to the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. For that matter, in view of the English precedents for prefaces, it is not necessary to suppose, as some have done, that Corneille's *examens* were the inspiration and model of Dryden's later prefaces.

² Equally significant is what was not borrowed from Corneille, either by Neander or by the other participants. This includes doctrines central to the matter and method of the French critic: his pronounced theory of pleasure as the sole end of poetry (see *Œuvres*, i. 13 and *passim*: Dryden adopted the Horatian view of the dual end of poetry; see Ker, i. 123); his aversion to poetic justice (*Œuvres*, i. 21, also 'Épître de la Suite du Menteur', iv. 282-4); his dislike of love as a tragic theme (i. 24); his scrupulous preoccupation with *vraisemblance* (see especially 'Deuxième Discours', *passim*); and his conspicuous deference to Aristotelian precedent. Corneille's point of departure for every topic is Aristotle, whom he first quotes and then interprets. Corneille devotes much attention to such Aristotelian 'problems' as the subject patterns of drama (i. 65-72) and the manners (i. 32; 36-39). On the other hand, Dryden considered in the *Essay* a number of critical subjects nowhere discussed by Corneille, such as wit, the idea of progress in poetry, the humours, tragic-comedy, and rime. Central to Corneille's critique is an Aristotelian formalism desirous of reconciling the rules to the exigencies of the modern stage; central to Dryden's is an impatience with all fetters and prescriptive claims of tradition.

THE VANITY OF HUMAN WISHES

By HENRY GIFFORD

WHEN he wanted to express his own feelings in poetry, as a rule Johnson used Latin. But at least once he seems to have turned for this to translation. In the last months of his life he rendered Horace, *Odes*, iv. vii. The poignancy of its theme for Johnson is clear:

Her losses soon the Moon supplies,
But wretched Man, when once he lies
Where Priam and his sons are laid,
Is naught but Ashes and a Shade.
Who knows if Jove who counts our Score
Will toss us in a morning more?¹

The pagan sentiment may not be wholly his; in an imitation doubtless he would have corrected it, as he corrected Juvenal's sentiment in the last paragraph of *The Vanity of Human Wishes*. Yet, even though its thoughts and images derive entirely from Horace, this rendering has the tone of personal conviction. It has ceased to be merely a translation, though a good one, and has taken on its own character.

In the same way *The Vanity of Human Wishes* is far more than an imitation of Juvenal's Tenth Satire. It moves us as an original poem, and the feelings it moves are different from those stirred by Juvenal. How radically Johnson has changed the poem may be considered after some brief comments on Juvenal's temper.

I

Johnson himself has defined 'the peculiarity of Juvenal' as 'a mixture of gaiety and stateliness, of pointed sentences, and declamatory grandeur'.² This description is not wholly accurate. 'Declamatory grandeur' we may readily grant: Juvenal's grandeur lies in his attitude of superb scorn, quite free from pathos or sense of awe. His sentences too are pointed—with insult. In the words that Johnson applies to Democritus, they 'Dart the quick taunt, and edge the piercing gibe' (62). Gaiety, of a caustic, Hogarthian kind, is undoubtedly there. But the stateliness Johnson seems to have exaggerated. Juvenal is vehement, and he can be terrible; but the exasperation in his voice—'Semper ego auditor tantum?' (i. 1)—robs him of real

¹ *The Poems of Samuel Johnson*, ed. D. Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam (Oxford, 1941), p. 232. For the effect of Horace's poem on another translator see Grant Richards, *Housman 1897-1936* (London, 1941), p. 289.

² Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1905), i. 447 (Dryden, § 300).

stateliness, such as Dante shows when denouncing the Florentines through the mouth of Brunetto Latini.¹ Johnson sees stateliness in Juvenal where others have been more struck with the poet's sarcasm and vituperation.

Juvenal invokes the laughing and the weeping sages, Democritus and Heraclitus; but, as Mr. D. E. Eichholz has pointed out,² it is the pitiless laughter of Democritus that rings through the poem. Juvenal's mood is one of derision, of 'cutting irony'. Johnson unsuitably retains the long passage addressed to Democritus:

Once more, Democritus, arise on earth,
With chearful wisdom and instructive mirth,
See motley life in modern trappings dress'd,
And feed with varied fools th' eternal jest. . . . (49-52)

Here for once the palimpsest is transparent. At no time did Johnson conceive of life as an 'eternal jest': the echo from Juvenal is quite at variance with his own voice in the rest of the poem.

Clearly he was attracted to Juvenal by the genuine moral fervour, the rhetorical brilliance, and the realism of his satire. Juvenal's sweep and weight and continuous surge of wit would all make him a congenial poet. However, there was another side to his temperament—the savagery and prurience and the crass Roman inhumanity—which could not please Johnson. It is noteworthy that only twice did Johnson imitate Juvenal, choosing the Third Satire which could easily be adapted to political ends, and the Tenth in which Juvenal is at his most abstract and general. He took some pains to ennoble the Latin satirist. It was Dryden, always ready to 'trade in corruption', who caught the unpleasing tones in Juvenal.

Probably Johnson would not have ventured to imitate the Tenth Satire had he felt that Dryden's rendering was successful. In all Dryden translated five of the Satires. Johnson's comment is just: 'The general character of this translation will be given when it is said to preserve the wit, but to want the dignity of the original.'³ The lines on Demosthenes are perhaps a fair sample of Dryden's skill:

Nor he, the Wonder of the *Grecian* throng,
Who drove them with the Torrent of his Tongue,
Who shook the Theaters, and sway'd the State
Of *Athens*, found a more Propitious Fate.
Whom, born beneath a boding Horoscope,
His Sire, the Blear-Ey'd *Vulcan* of a Shop,
From *Mars* his Forge, sent to *Minerva's* Schools,
To learn th' unlucky Art of wheedling Fools. (198-205)

¹ *Inferno*, xv, 61 f.

² In an article to appear shortly in *Greece and Rome*: 'The Art of Juvenal and his Tenth Satire'.

³ *Lives*, i. 447 (Dryden, § 300).

Here the neatness is evident: Dryden has imparted order and pliancy to the passage. But a glance at the original will show what has been lost in dignity:

saevus et illum
 exitus eripuit, quem mirabantur Athenae
 torrentem et pleni moderantem frena theatri.
 dis ille adversis genitus fatoque sinistro,
 quem pater ardentis massae fuligine lippus
 a carbone et forcipibus gladiosque paranti
 incude et luteo Vulcano ad rhetora misit. (126-32)

Dryden brings about some considerable changes to gain elegance. He waives the grim emphasis of the opening words for a flat negative statement: 'Nor he . . . / Found a more Propitious Fate.' He puts aside the doubly oppressive weight of 'dis ille adversis genitus fatoque sinistro' for the dull phrase 'born beneath a boding Horoscope' (though its alliteration makes some amends). Next, to secure a telling antithesis—'From *Mars* his Forge, sent to *Minerva's* Schools'—he gives up all the smoke and confusion and clangour of the workshop. Finally he tacks on a gratuitous line: 'To learn th' unlucky Art of wheedling Fools.' Here he does indeed lose dignity. Demosthenes swept his audience like a torrent and drove them like a charioteer: this is not 'wheedling'. Dryden further diverts our scorn from the orator to the mob.¹

With Juvenal, as with the other Latin poets whom he translated, Dryden copes cheerfully and often well. He writes vigorous and easy verse, but he is not deeply engaged in his rendering, whereas Juvenal insists: 'facit indignatio versum' (i. 79). Dryden lacks moral conviction. In 1685 he had spoken lightly of being 'troubled with the disease (as I may call it) of translation . . .'.² Juvenal was merely one more Latin poet to turn into sound English. All this separates him from Johnson in his approach to the 'Divine Satyr'. Johnson seized upon it to make a personal statement on not dissimilar lines, and to reiterate what he had said in the *Life of Savage*: 'the general lot of mankind is misery'.³

II

The very title of Johnson's poem indicates a divergence from Juvenal. The Tenth Satire deals not so much with 'the vanity of human wishes', as with 'the temptations and dangers of prayer'.⁴ Whereas Johnson concludes that 'petitions yet remain' (349), and warns his reader only against 'The

¹ And, as Mr. Eichholz has pointed out to me, Dryden 'completely misses the sudden shock of *ad rhetora*, so cunningly masked by the accumulation of details from the workshop'.

² Preface to *Sylvae*.

³ *Lives*, ii. 321.

⁴ Eichholz, *op. cit.*

160 GIFFORD: *THE VANITY OF HUMAN WISHES*

secret ambush of a specious pray'r' (354), Juvenal despises prayer altogether. He tolerates it only because men are weak:

ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis
exta et candiduli divina tomacula porci, . . . (354-5)

Dryden takes the tone of this reference to 'little sausages of a little white pig' when he writes: 'Yet not to rob the Priests of pious Gain . . .' (546). Both Dryden and Juvenal here are, to say the least, unsatisfactory in Johnson's eyes.

It is the tragic sense of life that informs Johnson's poem. In structure *The Vanity of Human Wishes* may not differ greatly from the Tenth Satire. The real transmutation is brought about by Johnson's imagery no less than by the tone of his moral comment. Sometimes the imagery develops a mere hint in Juvenal. From a single phrase, 'remota/ erroris nebula' (3-4), springs up this total vision of human life:

Then say how hope and fear, desire and hate,
O'erspread with snares the clouded maze of fate,
Where wav'ring man, betray'd by vent'rous pride,
To tread the dreary paths without a guide,
As treach'rous phantoms in the mist delude,
Shuns fancied ills, or chases airy good. . . . (5-10)

This is the first of many 'extensive views' revealed to 'observation':¹

But scarce observ'd, the knowing and the bold
Fall in the gen'ral massacre of gold;
Wide-wasting pest! that rages unconfin'd. . . . (21-23)
. . . dubious title shakes the madded land. (30)
Yet still one gen'ral cry the skies assails,
And gain and grandeur load the tainted gales. . . . (45-46)

Unnumber'd suppliants croud Preferment's gate,
Athirst for wealth, and burning to be great;
Delusive Fortune hears th' incessant call,
They mount, they shine, evaporate, and fall.² (73-76)

¹ The opening couplet—

Let observation with extensive view,
Survey mankind, from China to Peru—

can be defended. 'Observation' is not to be acquired in the study: *Cato* may derive from learning, whereas '*Othello* is the vigorous and vivacious offspring of observation impregnated by genius' (*Preface to Shakespeare*). Again from the same work: 'There is a vigilance of observation and accuracy of distinction which books and precepts cannot confer.' Johnson calls for the kind of observation enjoined in *Rasselas*, ch. x, to examine the whole extent of life as it is actually lived.

² *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 224 f.

I have touch'd the highest point of all my greatness;
And from that full meridian of my glory,

Not one of these images was prompted by Juvenal. Their effect is to give a grave universality to Johnson's statements. It should be noted that he stresses this by writing of 'the gen'ral massacre', 'one gen'ral cry', and again of 'ev'ry stage' (77), 'every room' (83), 'search every state, and canvas ev'ry prayer' (72). The sense of an ineluctably shared condition brings to mind Blake's 'London':

In every cry of every man,
In every infant's cry of fear,
In every voice, in every ban,
The mind-forg'd manacles I hear.¹

Johnson's manacles are the ambitions and desires of men; he is no less insistent than Blake in saying that they are general.

The tragic view is expressed also in his numerous images of downfall. Much of the evocative power in Johnson's poetry comes from his verbs,² and it is the repetition of *sinking* and *falling* that gives a marked pattern to the poem:

How nations *sink*, by darling schemes oppress'd. (13)
... the *sinking* statesman's door. (79)
For why did Wolsey near the steeps of fate,
On weak foundations raise th'enormous weight?
Why but to *sink* beneath misfortune's blow,
With louder ruin to the gulphs below? (125-8)³
But scarce observ'd, the knowing and the bold
Fall in the gen'ral massacre of gold. . . . (21, 22)
From every room *descends* the painted face. . . . (83)
Now beauty *falls* betray'd, despis'd, distress'd. . . . (341)

Through these and other images is mediated a philosophy of life at once more sombre and more compassionate than Juvenal's. The poem, for all its general statement, is deeply coloured with Johnson's own feeling. A casual image may reveal this: 'Fate wings with ev'ry wish th'afflictive

I haste now to my setting: I shall fall
Like a bright exhalation in the evening,
And no man see me more.

¹ *Songs of Experience*, 1794.

² Donald Davie in his *Purity of Diction in English Verse* (London, 1952), pp. 35 f., brings out this 'unusual metaphorical force residing in the verb'.

³ This image is found in the original:

numerosa parabat
excelsae turris tabulata, unde altior esset
casus et impulsae praeceps inmane ruinae. (105-7)

But 'the gulphs below' are Johnson's. Cf. 312: 'Who set unclouded in the gulphs of fate.'

dart' (15). A sentence from the thirty-second *Rambler* brings out the overtones:

... the armies of pain send their arrows against us on every side, the choice is only between those which are more or less sharp, or tinged with poison of greater or less malignity. . . .

In Johnson's view man is everywhere the victim:

Unnumber'd maladies his joints invade,
Lay siege to life, and press the dire blockade. . . . (283-4)
Yet even on this her load Misfortune flings. (299)
Should no Disease thy torpid veins invade,
Nor Melancholy's phantoms haunt thy shade;
Yet hope not life from grief or danger free,
Nor think the doom of man revers'd for thee. . . . (153-6)

He must stand up against invasion, bear overwhelming loads, face an irreversible doom; and suffer the 'wide-wasting pest' (23), the fever that burns through his veins (137-8), the madness that 'fires the mind' (231).¹ These assailants are indeed, like the 'fever of renown' in Johnson's first version, and like the attractions of martial glory, 'resistless'.

Johnson often rebates his satire, or gives it up altogether, when he contemplates human suffering. Wanton beauty or miserable old age are fair game for Juvenal; but Johnson shrinks from the spectacle.

Now beauty falls betray'd, despis'd, distress'd,
And hissing Infamy proclaims the rest. (341-2)

The poet himself is silent. Johnson does not dwell on the deformities of old age; rather he describes its social miseries:

The still returning tale, and ling'ring jest,
Perplex the fawning niece and pamper'd guest,
While growing hopes scarce awe the gath'ring sneer,
And scarce a legacy can bribe to hear. . . . (275-8)

The distinctive note of Johnson's feeling sounds in the beautiful line, 'Year

¹ The physical force of Johnson's imagery is well illustrated by his five uses of the verb *crowd* in this poem:

And *crowds* with crimes the records of mankind. (24)
Unnumber'd suppliants *crowd* Preferment's gate. (73)
And all the sons of ravage *crowd* the war. (250)
But everlasting dictates *crowd* his tongue. (273)
In *crowd* at once where none the pass defend,
The harmless Freedom, and the private Friend. (337-8)

The first sense of *crowd* given in the *Dictionary* is 'To fill with confused multitudes'. Such verbs as *crowd* and *invade* which recur through the poem bring home the sense of irresistible powers unleashed, of violent temptations and insupportable pains.

chases year, decay pursues decay'¹ (305), signaling by its grave measure a rhythm in life to which man must submit. The thought has no exact counterpart in Juvenal's poem. It recalls the ode of Horace already mentioned:

immortalia ne speres, monet annus . . .
The changing year's successive plan
Proclaims mortality to Man.²

In such ways the personal element shines through *The Vanity of Human Wishes*. The essential Johnson is here, and we come upon him at every turn:

Now fears in dire vicissitude invade,
The rustling brake alarms, and quiv'ring shade,
Nor light nor darkness bring his pain relief,
One shews the plunder, and one hides the thief. (41-44)

The lines describe the benefits of poverty; but it is hard not to fancy a larger resonance in the first and third, which is muted when the completion of each couplet restores Juvenal's context.

III

The gulf between Johnson and Juvenal is amply clear in the famous passage on Charles of Sweden. As the Oxford editors note, 'Johnson had long been interested in Charles and had thought of writing a play about him. . . .'³ The play no doubt would have been a tragedy; and Johnson's presentation of Charles in this passage is tragic. Juvenal had treated Hannibal, the prototype of Charles, with the most biting sarcasm. Immediately before this episode, he used an image worthy of Hogarth—the barren fig-tree that cracks the monument—to demonstrate the futility of fame. Then he turns upon Hannibal, and the invective leads up to a shattering climax:

finem animae quae res humanas miscuit olim,
non gladii, non saxa dabunt nec tela, sed ille
Cannarum vindex et tanti sanguinis ultor
anulus. i demens et saevas curre per Alpes,
ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias. (163-7)

Hannibal, who has caused so much havoc and confusion, is finished off by a mere ring with its poison. He has careered madly over the wild Alps—to what end? For schoolboy orators to make speeches about him. The decisive word here is *demens*:

a tale . . . full of sound and fury
Signifying nothing.

¹ Partly repeated in 'The Ant' (*Poems*, p. 152): 'Year chases year, with unremitting flight.

² *Poems*, p. 231.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 40 n.

Johnson follows the method of violent contrast. Like Juvenal, he presents a series of scenes; there is only the barest narrative frame, but one scene is linked to another by implication:

The march begins in military state,
And nations on his eye suspended wait. . . . (205-6)

The vanquish'd hero leaves his broken bands,
And shews his miseries in distant lands;
Condemn'd a needy supplicant to wait,
While ladies interpose, and slaves debate. (211-14)

All that is left of his 'military state' are the broken bands; and the repetition of the rhyming word *wait* in l. 213 points the contrast between Charles the arbiter of nations and Charles the beggarly exile. Juvenal had no military state—simply a one-eyed general on his last elephant. The grandeur imparted by Johnson heightens the catastrophe. There is a noble extravagance in Charles's boast:

'Think nothing gain'd,' he cries, 'till nought remain,
On Moscow's walls till Gothic standards fly,
And all be mine beneath the polar sky.' (202-4)

The hint from Juvenal—' . . . opposuit natura Alpemque nivemque' (152)—is developed in the stark imagery of

Stern Famine guards the solitary coast,
And Winter barricades the realms of Frost. . . . (208-9)

Charles, the victim of a superb delusion, invades the realms of frost and the polar solitude. This quest of the absolute has a pathetic outcome:

His fall was destin'd to a barren strand,
A petty fortress, and a dubious hand. . . . (219-20)

The scene narrows rapidly. First a barren strand, then a fortress of no note; finally the hand: its owner is lost to history, the function alone matters. Johnson has not mocked or reviled Charles: what he recounts here is one more 'scene of pompous woe'.

No couplet in *The Vanity of Human Wishes* is more memorable than the following:

Must helpless man, in ignorance sedate,
Roll darkling down the torrent of his fate? (345-6)

It has a visionary depth nowhere, I believe, to be matched in Juvenal. And it lies at the very heart of Johnson's poem. He faces here an awful possibility that dwarfs the satirical intention. In the light of it he can never forget the predicament of man, never abandon himself to the mundane views

of the satirist. Johnson is concerned here with the deepest things in his experience. He meets the challenge of life with a moral grandeur that transcends the pessimism in this poem, and enriches the verse with a positive value. Thus *The Vanity of Human Wishes* goes far beyond satire: it deals not with manners, with vice or folly, but with the mystery of human existence.

THE EARLIEST INFLUENCES ON A SHROPSHIRE LAD

By A. N. MARLOW

FOR the beginnings of the music of Housman's poetry, for the earliest influences which determined his choice of metre and subject, we must return to his schooldays. While at Bromsgrove School he read *Ballads from Herodotus* by the Rev. J. E. Bode, 'a book', as A. S. F. Gow says, 'now wholly forgotten but sufficiently popular in the 'fifties to reach a second edition'.¹ This book contains seventeen stories from Herodotus told for the most part in ballad metres which are vigorous though prone to jingle and bathos. The tales of 'Cleobis and Biton', 'Cræsus on the Pyre', 'Pactyas and Aristodicus', 'The Fate of Polycrates', 'The Return of Syloson', and 'Perdiccas' are put into rhyming couplets fairly exemplified by the following:

'Tomorrow's hour the sky may lour, the storm descend on me,
And I, like yonder victim pale, may doomed and helpless be;
For who can tell the ways of fate, and what a day may bring?'—
And he bade them quench the kindling pyre, and save his brother-king.²

There is one allusion to a story from Herodotus in the poems which Housman himself published, and it is in the same metre as the lines just quoted; but the fastidious workmanship of the poet has transformed the effect by two simple changes; first by alternating the rhymes, so as to knit the stanza into a closer whole, and secondly by the use of feminine endings in the odd lines:

'Tis mute, the word they went to hear on high Dodona mountain
When winds were in the oakenshaws and all the cauldrons tolled,
And mute's the midland navel-stone beside the singing fountain,
And echoes list to silence now where gods told lies of old.³

The stories of 'Atys and Adrastus', 'The Wooing of Agarista', and 'The Feast of Attaginus' are told in trochaic tetrameters catalectic, printed as single lines in the third poem named:

What avail the heaven-sent thunders, in the distance rolling deep,
If the souls they fain would waken slumber still in heedless sleep?
What avails to mark the storm-clouds gathering in the darkening sky,
If the feet are bound and move not, though the shelter seemeth nigh?⁴

¹ A. E. Housman, *A Sketch* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 3.

² *Cræsus*, v. 12.

³ *Last Poems*, xxv (London, 1922), ('The Oracles').

⁴ 'The Feast of Attaginus', v. 14.

In movement and diction the poem of 'Atys and Adrastus' reminds us of passages in *A Shropshire Lad*:

With a doom of ceaseless sorrow
Who like me by fate opprest?
Wherefore live to meet a morrow
That can bring me nought of rest?¹

Housman's own poem on Atys, not published till after his death, is in this same metre, and his brother gives us an interesting sidelight on its production: 'Atys was one of the two poems which A. E. H. sent me to choose from when I was editing *The Venture* in 1903: but he kept no fair copy of it; and when I asked why he had not included it in *Last Poems* he said because it was written in a metre he was so fond of, that he always doubted the merit of any poem in which he had succumbed to its attraction.'² It is quite likely that Bode was among the first, if not the first, to plant in him the seed of this liking. His own poem on Atys is much richer in colour, more compressed and more vigorously rhythmical, but the difference is one of degree merely:

Lydians, as the troop advances,
—It is eve and I am old—
Tell me why they trail their lances,
Washers of the sands of gold.

I am old and day is ending
And the wildering night comes on;
Up the Mysian entry wending,
Lydians, Lydians, what is yon?³

Of the poems which he copied out in a notebook at school and at Oxford many are to be found in *Sabrinae Corolla*, a volume of versions in Greek and Latin by scholars of Shrewsbury School of poems or parts of poems in English, German, and Italian. For instance, the opening lines of Byron's *Parisina* are there:

It is the hour when from the boughs
The nightingale's high note is heard;
It is the hour when lovers' vows
Seem sweet in every whispered word;

lines which may have echoed in Housman's brain when he wrote:

Under the stars the air was light
But dark below the boughs,
The still air of the speechless night,
When lovers crown their vows.⁴

¹ 'Atys and Adrastus', part II.

² A.E.H. (London, 1937), p. 212.

⁴ *A Shropshire Lad* (London, 1896), liii. 33-36.

³ Ibid., p. 215.

One poem, No. xxxv of *Last Poems*, is modelled on an anonymous Greek epigram of which an English version appears in *Sabrinæ Corolla*. The original, No. ix. 138 in the Palatine Anthology, runs as follows:

Ἦν νέος ἀλλὰ πένης, νῦν γηρῶν πλούσιός εἰμι,
ὦ μόνος ἐκ πάντων οἰκτρὸς ἐν ἀμφοτέροις,
Ὅς τότε μὲν χρῆσθαι δυνάμην ὅπότ' οὐδὲ ἔν εἶχον,
νῦν δ' ὅποτε χρῆσθαι μὴ δύναμαι τότ' ἔχω.

'I was young but poor: now in old age I am rich, alas that I am most pitiable of men in both, for then I could enjoy when I had nothing and now when I cannot enjoy I have the means.'

The version in *Sabrinæ Corolla* moves with a jerkier rhythm:

I was poor, but I was twenty,
Now at threescore I have plenty;
What a miserable lot!
Now that I have hoarded treasure,
I no more can taste of pleasure;
When I could, I had it not.¹

The 'great and real troubles of my early manhood' which Housman refers to were financial as well as spiritual, and must have reinforced the appeal of these lines; and at some time before 1910 he wrote his own poem on the same theme, personal and fresh. He had made the sentiment truly his own:

When first my way to fair I took
Few pence in purse had I,
And long I used to stand and look
At things I could not buy.

Now times are altered: if I care
To buy a thing, I can;
The pence are here, and here's the fair,
But where's the lost young man?

To think that two and two are four
And neither five nor three
The heart of man has long been sore
And long 'tis like to be.

Other poems in *Sabrinæ Corolla* are echoed in *A Shropshire Lad*; in particular several passages from Milton; a poem on the death of the brave by Burns which ends with the line, 'Oh, who would not rest with the brave?'—a line which with the change of one word furnished a refrain for No. vi of *Last Poems*; and an occasional phrase such as 'love unlov'd again'

¹ *Sabrinæ Corolla*, p. 158.

in a poem by Aytoun. None of the great Victorian poets is adequately represented in *Sabrinae Corolla*, but it is remarkable that several comparatively little-known poems such as 'The Recall' by Barry Cornwall and 'Dirge' by Beddoes appear in the book and in Housman's notebook which he made at this time. A good deal of his English reading as well as his love for the classics seems to have been derived from or suggested by *Sabrinae Corolla*.

It is difficult to account for his fondness for the *Poems and Romances* of George Augustus Simcox, published in 1869.¹ Perhaps he was led to sample them by knowing that Simcox was a classical tutor and had published a history of Latin literature; and having once sampled them was attracted by those poems which treated of death and parting. The background of nearly all the poems of Simcox is the equivalent in words of the paintings of Rossetti and of Burne-Jones's *Cophetua and the Beggar Maid*; an atmosphere of lilies and languishing, the outdoor scenes unreal and wan and the heroines tall and fair, pale and tragic. They bear such titles as 'The Beloved', 'Blind Love', 'The Farewell of Ganore', 'Forget-me-nots', 'The Raven and the Dove', 'Lucilla', 'Amabel', 'Song'. This last is worth quoting in full, for it is typical of the competent versification and somewhat empty prettiness of *Poems and Romances*:

Come away, love, come away,
I am weary of my clay;
Come away, love, come away.

Hear me from thy holy place;
Come, I have not seen thy face,
Have not tasted of thy grace.

Come, thou lingerest far behind,
And they say that thou art kind,
But thy step is like the wind.

Rise, my queen, and carry me
To the pastures of the sea,
Which are shepherded by thee.

Carry me, I do not care,
To the solitary air
Which thy fulness maketh fair.

Oh, my love, thou fliest fast!
When the rapture shall be past,
When I fall to earth at last,

¹ In his early notebooks Housman copied in full four poems from Simcox: 'Gawain and the Lady of Avalon' (15 pages), 'The Troades', 'Si descendero in infernum, ades', and 'Epilogue'.

Waft me on a gentle sigh;
Lay me softly down to die
Where the last year's roses lie.

Elsewhere Simcox writes in the manner of the *Idylls of the King*, as in 'The Farewell of Ganore':

'Men only have I tried,
And they have shallow hearts, and so have I.
I will away from them before I die,
And be a little child, and taste the summer tide.
I will away; the sunny world is wide,—'
'And desolate,' her aching heart replied.

Even here there is something in the solemn reply of the heart that would appeal to Housman, and in one of the last poems he ever wrote we find the heart replying with grim realism to the man who thinks of roaming far afield.

It cannot have been for his landscapes that Housman so much admired Simcox, for of landscape-description there is very little, and that little is felt merely as a generalized romantic background:

Along the hawthorn-scented brook
Athwart the evening sky . . .

'The Farewell of Ganore' has descriptions of wild brakes and heaths, but their colouring is not quite natural. It is in the language that we must seek the source of Simcox's attraction. There are in several poems lines that need very little strengthening or stiffening to acquire the resonance that we associate with *A Shropshire Lad* and *Last Poems*. In the twenty-first verse of the long poem 'Lucilla', for example, is a line that seems startlingly familiar:

She stood alone and bleeding,
And she was sore afraid;
She looked to see a vessel,
And none were near to aid.

Housman's 'I walked alone and thinking' is, of course, not necessarily a conscious reminiscence, but later in the poem which this line begins we have lines which faintly recall other lines of Simcox:

By night I plucked it hueless,
When morning broke 'twas blue:
Blue at my breast I fastened
The flower of sinner's rue.¹

This is as near as Housman gets to the atmosphere of the Pre-Raphaelites,

¹ L.P., xxx.

the idea of wearing flowers for remembrance being dear to the followers of Rossetti, and Simcox has a kind of Victorian counterpart, in the same metre:

With each of them was buried,
To ripen or to rot,
Deep underground for ages,
A blue forget-me-not.¹

In each of these verses of Simcox the last line or two falls away into sentimentality or bathos. 'Deep underground for ages', with its weak adverb, is a line Housman would never have written, and in place of the wan forget-me-not his flower is plucked to remind him of a suicide.

One more line of Simcox is very like a line of Housman, though its context is more on the level of Ella Wheeler Wilcox:

Quick, cast the glass out after the gold,
There may still be time to think
How the sun is warm and the waves are cold,
And brine is a bitter drink.²

For a mid-Victorian this is quite outspoken, though wanting in the bitter calm which fills its echo in Housman:

'Tis true there's better booze than brine, but he that drowns must drink it,
And oh, my lass, the news is news that men have heard before.³

There is one poem which clearly owes much to Simcox in both language and subject. 'Hell Gate', No. xxxi of *Last Poems*, recalls two poems of Simcox in the same metre, 'Amabel' and 'Si descendero in infernum, ades'. Its theme is like that of the latter poem; Simcox portrays a girl rescued from the portals of Hell by Christ, and Housman's Shropshire Lad (for the poem is one of the earlier cycle although it is in the later book) is saved from Hell by his earthly comrade. In 'Amabel' the girl of that name follows a fairy knight all day over the country-side, never overtaking him, till at nightfall she finds herself all alone in a strange landscape. Incidentally this reminds us of Housman's 'Merry Guide',⁴ in which he imagines Hermes as not only *ψυχοπομπός* or escorter of the dead to Hades but also the enchanter and beguiler of the living, who follow him

By blowing realms of woodland
With sunstruck vanes afield
And cloud-led shadows sailing
About the windy weald.

When Amabel at length looks back she is terrified:

Then fair Amabel looked back
And the fairy spell was broken,

¹ 'Forget-me-Nots'.

² 'The Raven and the Dove', st. 16.

³ *L.P.*, xxv.

⁴ *A.S.L.*, xlii.

And the serpent lightnings woke,
 And the lordly thunder spoke.
 When she turned her cowering head,
 Knight and mead and day were fled,
 She was standing all alone.

So, when Ned turns against the powers of Hell,

Over us the darkness bowed,
 And the anger in the cloud
 Clenched the lightning for the stroke;
 But the traitor musket spoke.

Housman, too, with much greater force and incisiveness, makes use of the contrast between the thunder and the calm when the travellers find that Hell has vanished:

And the hollowness of hell
 Sounded as its master fell,
 And the mourning echo rolled
 Ruin through his kingdom old.
 Tyranny and terror flown
 Left a pair of friends alone,
 And beneath the nether sky
 All that stirred was he and I.

The poem 'Si descendero in infernum, ades' has no doubt suggested the whole treatment of 'Hell Gate', but between the two poems there is a world of difference. A girl Rosalie approaches the city of Hell:

So they came unto the city
 Of the king who hath no pity:
 And that city needs for light
 Sun by day nor moon by night:
 It is lighted in such wise
 By the King's devouring eyes,
 Flashing through the dusky air,
 For the eyes are everywhere.
 And we call the city Hell,
 But the people there who dwell
 Name it by another name,
 And no man may speak the same.
 And the golden gate of it,
 Where the purple shadows flit,
 Where the mighty wardens sit
 Are not shut by night or day,
 For the city-people say,
 Wherefore keep the souls away,

Souls that long to enter in
To the harvest of their sin? . . .

By the light of that dread place
Rosalie beheld a face
As of One who went in pain
With one hand upon her rein. . . .
But upon her other hand
She beheld another stand
With a visage pale and grim,
And she spake in fear to him. . . .

So they came before his throne
Who shall reap where sin hath sown;
But she could not see the King,
Though she felt the dragon wing
Sharply overshadowing her,
And she saw not any there,
Neither Victor, nor her sire,
Nor the horse of gold and fire,
Nor the angry light of Hell,
Nor the angel Azrael.
Only One who walked the night,
Clad upon with tender light,
With a visage pale and sweet,
And with pierced hands and feet,
Saying, 'Staunch my wounded side
With more kisses, O my bride!
For the shadows flee away
Into everlasting day.'

There is here very little of the tense and electric atmosphere with which Housman charges his poem, and the helpless sentimentality of the last lines ruins the whole effect. Yet he obviously knew this poem in his youth, and copied it in metre and even here and there in manner, transforming the theme by firmer and clearer imagery and by terse precision of language.

NOTES

THE GREEN KNIGHT SHOELESS: A RECONSIDERATION

... hose of þat same grene,
 Þat spenet on his sparlyr, and clene spures vnder
 Of bryȝt golde, vpon silk bordes barred ful ryche,
 And scholes vnder schankes þere þe schalk rides. . . .¹

A MINOR point of perplexity in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is the word *scholes* in line 160. Is it the adjective 'shoeless', or is it a noun? And, if it should be a noun, what does it mean?

In their edition of the romance Professors Tolkien and Gordon, though not without some hesitation, accept Mr. P. G. Thomas's identification of this form with 'Ofr. *cholet*, a form of *soulet*, a kind of shoe or slipper'.² Sir Israel Gollancz, on the other hand, casts justifiable doubt on the existence of any such OFr. form as *cholet*, and himself takes *scholes* as referring to some kind of support 'covering the sole of the foot, and more especially under the shank, i.e. the "waist", or the part between heel and sole'. He bases this interpretation on the eighteenth-century use of *shole* for a timber foundation used in ship-building.³ Nor are these the only interpretations that have been put forward. Brett suggested that *scholes* meant 'some leather or other protections, under and inside the thighs, "where the man rides"', as in modern riding-breeches'.⁴ Skeat even took it to refer to some part of the horse's equipment.⁵

In view of the lack not only of certainty but even of agreement among those scholars interpreting *scholes* as a noun, it is perhaps permissible to re-examine the case for interpreting it as 'shoeless'. This interpretation, first suggested by Emerson in 1921,⁶ has indeed been endorsed by Professor Tolkien in his translation of *Sir Gawain* recently broadcast.

Before considering whether the sense 'shoeless' is in accordance with what we know of fourteenth-century dress, we must first dispose of the contention that, syntactically, it is impossible to construe *scholes* as an adjective. The basis for this contention is the apparent parallelism between

¹ *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (Oxford, 1925), lines 157-60.

² T.G., p. 86; cf. P. G. Thomas, 'The Middle English Alliterative Poem *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*', *Englische Studien*, xlvii (1913-14), 312.

³ *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (E.E.T.S. 210, 1940), p. 100.

⁴ Cyril Brett, 'Notes on "Cleanness" and "Sir Gawayne"', *M.L.R.*, x (1915), 189-90.

⁵ W. W. Skeat, 'Notes on English Etymology', *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1903-6, pp. 366-7.

⁶ O. F. Emerson, 'Two Notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *M.L.N.*, xxxvi (1921), 212-13, and also *J.E.G.P.*, xxi (1922), 367.

the construction of *scholes* and that of the preceding nouns, *cote*, *mantile*, *hode*, *hose*, *spures*; for, if admitted, this parallelism would seem to require that *scholes* also should be a noun. Analysis of usage elsewhere in the poem suggests, however, that this argument is flimsy. For, far from allowing himself to be bound by such grammatical formalities, the author of *Sir Gawain* often switches in his descriptions from one part of speech to another.

Thus, very commonly a string of adjectives will be broken by a noun parallel in effect though not in grammar:

Whene Guenore, ful gay, grayped in þe myddes,
Dressed on þe dere des, dubbed al aboute,
Smal sendal bisides, a selure hir ouer . . . (74-76)
I am þe wakkest, I wot, and of wyt feblest,
And *lest lur* of my lyf. . . . (354-5)
Sturne, stif on þe stryþþe on stalworth schonkeþ,
Felle face as þe fyre, and fre of hys speche. (846-7)

Admittedly, the reverse switch, the breaking of a string of nouns by the intrusion of an adjective, is rarer, but we may compare, for instance:

Wyth ryche cote-armure,
His gold sporeþ spend with pryde,
Gerde wyth a bront ful sure
With silk sayn vmbe his syde. (586-9)

Therefore, since the poet's technique is impressionistic rather than formally grammatical, it can hardly be maintained that usage elsewhere in the poem forbids the construing of *scholes* as an adjective.

As for the sense 'shoeless', support for this is by no means lacking. There seems indeed good reason for believing that in the later fourteenth century at least dandies often wore hose alone without shoes.¹ Thus, on f. 2 of B.M. Royal MS. 20 B vi there is a miniature which shows standing about Richard II several elegant courtiers with their particoloured hose and long-toed footgear all in one piece. Such doubtless were the *chausses semellées* of which in the one year 1396 the King of France had 131 pairs, together with eight pairs of leather *houseaulx* for wearing over them when riding.² In spite, however, of the royal *houseaulx*, men seem sometimes to have gone riding in their 'soled hose' only. Thus, in the Ellesmere Manuscript of *The Canterbury Tales*, the Knight, the Squire, and the Summoner all seem to be depicted riding in hose without shoes, and in *Les Très Riches*

¹ Cf., for example, H. Norris, *Costume and Fashion* (1927), ii. 274: 'Shoes do not appear to have been very much used among the fashionable during the second half of the fourteenth century save for ceremonial occasions. It was more usual to have the foot part all in one with the hose in order to continue particolour, then so popular, without a break.'

² Joan Evans, *Dress in Mediaeval France* (Oxford, 1952), p. 48.

Heures du Duc de Berry one of the gallants in the Maying party is similarly attired.¹ And indeed, as far as can be determined from the much-abraded illustrations in MS. Nero A x, the Green Knight himself seems to have been pictured without shoes.

Nor, indeed, does this style of dressing seem to have been confined to the fourteenth century. A passage in the late twelfth-century Spanish *Poema de Mio Cid* shows that at that time also dandies might go riding in hose alone. The passage in question occurs in the first Cantar of the *Poema*:

Ellos vienen cuesta yuso, e todos trahen calças
e las siellas coçeras e las cinchas amojadas;
nos cavalgaremos siellas gallegas, e huesas sobre calças;
ciento cavalleros devemos vencer aquellas mesnadas.²

The word *calças* is the medieval form of the modern word *calzas* 'hose, stockings'. *Huesas* means 'top boots'; Menéndez Pidal's explanation in the third volume of his edition of the *Poema* is that they were footwear which protected the legs from cold, rain, and mud, and were worn for campaigning, travelling, or hunting.³ He continues: 'According to the [*Poema*], the "huesa" was worn over the "calças", and to ride without "huesas" was the custom rather for courtiers than for warriors.' The implications of this passage are quite clear. The Cid was encouraging his small band of followers as they prepared to face the large numbers of Catalans, Moors, and Christians under the command of the Count of Barcelona. In spite of their superior numbers, these Catalans, according to the Cid, were less efficiently equipped and had less warlike accoutrements. Since it is stressed that the Cid's followers wore boots over their hose, we may presume that the Catalans were wearing only hose and no boots. There is another passage, this time in the third Cantar of the *Poema*, which throws some light on this point. It describes in detail how the Cid attired himself for the special occasion of the Cortes at Toledo, including the lines:

calças de buen paño en sus camas metió,
sobrellas unos çapatos que a grant huebra son.⁴

Therefore, since either boots or shoes might be worn over the *calças*, the mention of the latter alone must mean that the men were riding, as we are arguing that the Green Knight did, in their stockinged feet.⁵

¹ For both the last-mentioned manuscripts I have, of course, to refer to the facsimiles.

² (Clásicos Castellanos, Madrid, 1946), lines 992-5. Translation: 'They are coming downhill, all wearing hose. They have racing saddles and loose girths, but we shall ride with Galician saddles and wear boots over our hose. Though we number only one hundred knights we have to defeat this large army.'

³ *Cantar de Mio Cid* (Madrid, 1945), p. 896.

⁴ Lines 3085-6. Translation: 'The Cid covered his legs with good cloth hose and over these he drew his finely worked shoes.'

⁵ For drawing my attention to these passages and assisting me in interpreting them, I am greatly indebted to my colleague Mrs. Rita Hamilton.

The value of this parallel is that it brings out the significance of the Green Knight's 'shoelessness'. It is elsewhere emphasized how unwarlike was his array:

Wheper hade he no helme ne hawbergh nauþer,
Ne no pysan ne no plate þat pented to armes,
Ne no schafte ne no schelde to schwue ne to smyte,
Bot in his on honde he hade a holyn bobbe. . . . (203-6)

And he himself protests:

3e may be seker bi þis braunch þat I bere here
þat I passe as in pes, and no plyȝt seche;
For had I founded in fere in feȝtyng wyse,
I haue a hauberghe at home and a helme boþe,
A schelde and a scharp spere, schinande bryȝt,
Ande oþer weppenes to welde, I wene wel, als;
Bot for I wolde no were, my wedeȝ ar softer. (265-71)

And it is thus fully in accord with his 'soft' civilian dress that, like the Catalan dandies and the knights going a-Maying, he should be riding shoeless in his green hose.

CECILY CLARK

ROBERT TOFTE AN OXFORD MAN

KNOWLEDGE that others are now working on the Elizabethan poet Robert Tofte prompts me to make available the material that has come to light since I published my study in this Journal in 1937.¹

Lulled into security by the absence of the name from the published registers, I rashly stated that Tofte was not a university man. It now seems clear that he was the Robert Taft of London, aged nineteen and son of a gentleman, who matriculated at Oxford in 1582 as of Exeter College. Andrew Clark read the name as 'Taste', although he cited the revealing variant 'Tawghte' in the Matriculation Register.² For once Joseph Foster is more reliable, for his *Alumni Oxonienses* gives the name as Taft. Anyone who chooses, as I have done, to confirm Foster's reading may consult the Subscription Book 1581-1615 in the Bodleian, where on folio 4^v under date of 24 November 1581 a group of Exeter College men is headed by the signature 'Robertus Taft'. That Tofte used the spelling Taft on other

¹ 'Robert Tofte', *R.E.S.*, xiii (1937), pp. 282-96 and 405-24.

² *Register of the University of Oxford 1571-1622* (Oxford, 1887-9), ii. 106.

occasions was established in my study. The Oxford background both fills in the poet's education and gives point to a few allusions in his verses.

The documentation of the poet's life is reinforced with a deposition and signature brought to my attention by Dr. Mark Eccles. This Chancery action of Thomas Farmor and Nicholas Seafoule of Norfolk against Tofte's friend Thomas Goodall of Holborn appears irrelevant to literary history and need not be rehearsed.¹ Tofte's deposition for the defendant was made on 19 June 1602. Carelessly fixing his age as '36. yeres or therabouts', Tofte declares that on 20 May 1599 he had lent Goodall £10 on bond to be given to the complainant Seafoule; the money had not been repaid. The biographical value is to establish that Tofte's Holborn residence was already at this date in the Goodall household. Perhaps light is thrown on the poet's acquaintance with Archbishop Bancroft through the incidental information in Goodall's answer that Goodall was in the train of Bancroft on his bibulous mission to Emden in 1600.

Professor Eccles calls my attention to another possible lead in the published law reports of Sir James Dyer.² A Common Pleas case in Hilary term 8 Elizabeth (1566), hingeing on legal technicalities of estate administration, concerned one William Toft, declared intestate. Now the poet's father William had died in 1563, but his will was proved with the widow as executrix. Accordingly this would seem to be another William, possibly the grandfather, whose Christian name is untraced. Since the administrator bore the name Marshall, which is found in the Tofte circle,³ search at the Record Office may uncover further facts about the poet's family.

Too late for my study, Dr. Leslie Hotson has quoted from interesting verses by R. T[ofte], which he found in Malone MS. 16 at the Bodleian.⁴ Tofte's annotated copy of Chaucer, which I cited, was auctioned at Christie's on 3 July 1951.⁵ Evidence accumulates that Tofte's *Blazon of Iealousie* has had an unrecognized influence on later writers through the liberal borrowings by Robert Burton in the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Thus in his wholesale filching from Burton, Laurence Sterne assigns a Tofte couplet to Walter Shandy, and Tristram reports that this manuscript poem 'will be printed with my father's *Life of Socrates*, etc.'⁶ Through Burton, Tofte's tale of the two Thames swans has inspired a modern poem by Ashley Dukes.⁷ In conclusion, it is a pleasant duty to apologize to Dr. Grosart for

¹ At the Public Record Office the pleadings are C3. Eliz. 270/60. The depositions are C24/295/28. The poet signs as 'Roberte Tofte'.

² *Ascens Nouel Cases* (1585), f. 247.

³ John Marshall, Fishmonger, appears in the will of Robert Carter (PCC, 6 *Stevenson*), who was apparently the poet's uncle.

⁴ *I, William Shakespeare* (London, 1937), 234-6.

⁵ See *T.L.S.* (24 Aug. 1951), p. 538.

⁶ *Tristram Shandy*, VIII. xxvi.

⁷ Published in *T.L.S.* (16 May 1942), p. 250.

my remark that he failed to understand the anagram *Dnabsuh* in *The Fruits of Jealousie*. The solution occurred to Grosart in time to be included in a leaf of supplementary notes issued with some copies of his edition of *Alba* as page 155.

FRANKLIN B. WILLIAMS, JR.

BENLOWES'S BORROWINGS FROM GEORGE HERBERT

PROFESSOR Harold Jenkins (*Edward Benlowes*, London, 1952) does not mention George Herbert's poems in his chapter on Benlowes's reading. As he says, Benlowes as an undergraduate at Cambridge 'must have occasionally heard [Herbert] in the office of university orator: in later years, when Herbert's poems were being read everywhere, memories of such occasions would give cause for pleasurable pride' (p. 31). It would have been strange if Benlowes himself had not read *The Temple*: and, given his peculiar poetic constitution, stranger still, perhaps, if having read it he had nowhere borrowed from it. In fact, Theophila at the climax of her penitence (Canto ii. 91) uses the language of one of Herbert's finest lyrics:

Kind angry Lord, since Thou dost wound, yet cure;
I'll bear the yoke, the cross endure;
Lament, and love; and, when set free, keep conscience pure.

Compare Herbert's 'Bitter-sweet':

Ah my deare angrie Lord,
Since Thou dost love, yet strike;
Cast down, yet help afford;
Sure I will do the like.

I will complain, yet praise;
I will bewail, approve;
And all my sowre-sweet dayes
I will lament, and love.

It may be felt that Benlowes here has ruined the beautiful naturalness of Herbert's language by communicating to it his own peculiarly hectic colouring. Benlowes's other borrowing is from that one of Herbert's poems which is nearest to his own habitual manner, straining after the vivid, the pointed. Herbert's warmest admirers will hardly grudge Benlowes the

use of a line from 'The Church Porch', though here again the colour is heightened. Herbert in the first verse of 'The Church Porch' had written

A verse may finde him, who a sermon flies,

Benlowes in *Theophila*, Canto ix. 17, has

Love may them lead by verse whom sermons fright.

ELSIE DUNCAN-JONES

A SOURCE OF STERNE'S CONCEPTION OF TIME

OF all the unconventional theories entertained by Sterne in *Tristram Shandy*, that which influences most strongly the nature of this work is the idea that the perception of time depends upon individual consciousness. It is expressed by several of the characters who think the time longer or shorter than it is; the narrator himself delights in pointing out that duration, as it is perceived by the mind, and the time of clocks do not always coincide. Sterne makes Mr. Shandy try to explain the reason for this discrepancy:

... in order to shew my uncle *Toby* by what mechanism and mensurations in the brain it came to pass, that the rapid succession of their ideas, and the eternal scampering of the discourse from one thing to another, ... had lengthened out so short a period to so inconceivable an extent.¹

This attempt is made in a chapter which, among other obvious references, alludes directly to the title of Chapter 14 of Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*; consequently, it has been thought that Sterne's explanation of the relative nature of duration had been borrowed from Locke.²

The relation thus established between the *Essay* and *Tristram Shandy* does not stand if both texts are closely examined. In his demonstration, Locke asserts that the notion of duration is derived from a consciousness of the 'constant and regular' succession of ideas in the mind. He then makes a distinction between this inner reality, 'duration', and the abstract measure of it that we call 'time'. But nowhere in the fourteenth chapter of the *Essay* does Locke introduce the idea that the amount of duration perceived by the mind depends on the speed of its train of ideas. Locke draws closer to

¹ *Tristram Shandy*, iii. 18.

² See, for instance, T. Baird, 'The time scheme of *Tristram Shandy* and a source', *P.M.L.A.*, li (1936), 804.

Sterne's conception when, showing that the perception of duration ceases with the absence of a succession of ideas during sleep, he adds:

... and we see that one who fixes his thoughts very intently on one thing, ... lets slip out of his account a good part of that duration and thinks the time shorter than it is.¹

The philosopher, then, asserts that 'there seem to be certain bounds to the quickness and slowness of the succession of those ideas one to another in our minds, beyond which they can neither delay nor hasten'.² Thus Sterne's notion that the varying speed of the train of ideas determines the amount of duration perceived by the mind does not agree with Locke's conception of the succession of ideas as somewhat 'constant and regular'. Using some of Locke's phrases, Sterne expresses a theory which, far from being inspired by Locke's thought, is in contradiction to it.

Did Sterne, then, misread the *Essay*? If a charge of distortion is to be made, the defendant Sterne cannot appear as principal, but only as accomplice. Indeed the major responsibility for the misinterpretation of Locke's thought seems to lie with No. 94 of the *Spectator*, to which Sterne refers with approval in the 'Unpublished Fragment' discovered by Paul Stapfer. In this paper, which inquires into the means of relieving the boredom of idle people, Addison sums up Locke's theory, quoting the first passage of the *Essay* transcribed here, then introduces a variation of his own:

We might carry this thought further, and consider a Man as, on one Side, shortening his Time by thinking on nothing, or but a few things; so, on the other, as lengthening it, by employing his thoughts on many Subjects, or by entertaining a quick and constant Succession of Ideas.

Apparently forgetting that Locke had written '... one who *fixes* his thoughts very intently on *one thing* ...', Addison replaces it by 'thinking on *nothing*, or but a *few* things'. This substitution of terms, easily overlooked by the hasty reader, enables Addison to give an appearance of logic to the final part of his argument. Instead of carrying Locke's thought further, as he claims, Addison is in fact inaugurating a new line of reasoning. Whereas Locke was merely using a fact of common experience to support his theory of the origin of the idea of time, Addison, confusing fixedness and slow movement, makes the perception of duration dependent upon the speed of the train of ideas—a conjuring trick which would have surprised the author of the *Essay*. Addison then appeals to Malebranche for further 'justification', and concludes his philosophical excursion with a sentence that was the germ of Sterne's relativistic conception of time:

... for if our Notion of Time is produced by our reflecting on the Succession of Ideas in our Mind, and this succession may be infinitely accelerated or retarded,

¹ Locke, *Essay*, xiv. § 4.

² *Ibid.*, § 9.

it will follow, that Different Beings may have different notions of the same parts of Duration, according as their Ideas . . . follow one another in a greater or less Degree of Rapidity.

Thus the source of Sterne's startling theory was not in Locke's *Essay* but in the liberal interpretation which Addison gave of Locke's and Malebranche's thought in the *Spectator* of 18 June 1711. If there should persist any doubt, let it be considered that the two ways of 'lengthening one's time' indicated by Addison and Sterne are the same: to employ one's thoughts on many subjects, and to entertain a quick succession of ideas. Neither of them appears in the *Essay*. Locke, of course, provided both Addison and Sterne with the basic theory of the succession of ideas; but considering how important the notion of a variable duration was for Sterne, it may be said that the philosophical starting-point given by Locke was of less consequence than Addison's imaginative suggestion.

JEAN-CLAUDE SALLÉ

'ONE WHO MOST HAS SUFFERED': ARNOLD AND LEOPARDI?

In his recently published Reynard Library edition of Matthew Arnold, Mr. John Bryson has mentioned a suggestion of mine that Arnold may have had Leopardi in mind in writing stanza xix of *The Scholar-Gipsy*. I should like to say a little more about my reasons.

First of all, is it legitimate to go beyond Arnold's explicit statement that it was Goethe he had in mind? That statement was made many years later, and it is hard to think of everything that is said in the stanza as applying to Goethe and to Goethe alone. As Professors Tinker and Lowry have set the example of canvassing the claims of another candidate (Tennyson), it is perhaps not altogether rash to follow them. My claim is simply that *if* we admit the possibility that the poet referred to may be a composite figure and not simply and exclusively Goethe, then Leopardi has at least as good a claim as Tennyson to having contributed some features to the portrait.

There is a striking coincidence between Arnold's diagnosis of the 'strange disease of modern life' and that of Leopardi. The contrast between the single-minded spontaneity of the ancients, to which the scholar-gipsy has contrived in some measure to return, and the wisdom that has brought with it only uncertainty and unhappiness is pure Leopardi. Moreover, it is very specially the Leopardi of the 1844 essay by Sainte-Beuve (mentioned by Mr. Bryson) which may reasonably be conjectured to have been

Arnold's first introduction to the poet. There are also similarities of phrasing between this essay and Arnold's poem that have encouraged me to think my suggestion plausible.

Sainte-Beuve compares Leopardi with other romantic writers as 'poètes et peintres du désespoir: Byron, Shelley, Oberman',¹ and finds Byron closest to him, but distinguishes Leopardi from Byron as being 'né pour être positivement un Ancien, un homme de la Grèce héroïque ou de Rome libre, et cela sans déclamation aucune et par la force même de sa nature. Il croyait que là seulement l'homme avait eu une vue simple des choses, un déploiement heureux et naturel de ses facultés.' A few pages earlier, he has summarized Leopardi's preface to *Bruto Minore*. He describes the poem as 'la clef de toute la philosophie négative de Leopardi, le cachet personnel et original de son genre de sensibilité poétique', and the preface as 'ce morceau capital'.² It is the account which follows that has some verbal parallels in *The Scholar-Gipsy*: 'l'esprit humain, marchant avec les siècles, a découvert la nudité et comme le squelette des choses [cf. Arnold's 'Lays bare']... Brutus meurt le dernier des Anciens, et il crie au monde qu'il s'est trompé dans sa noble espérance. A partir de ce jour-là, l'humanité dépouilla sa robe virile et entra dans les années de deuil et de triste expérience ['sad experience']'. And on the next page Leopardi himself is 'triste comme un Ancien venu trop tard'—the apt pendant to the scholar-gipsy, 'born in days when wits were fresh and clear'.

I do not claim that the second half of the stanza fits Leopardi, and I would reiterate that I am working on the hypothesis that the portrait is composite and cannot be made to fit any one original. If we must be unitarians, Goethe is the only candidate: none but he could be, for Arnold, in an unqualified way 'our wisest'. But I claim that the whole scheme of contrast between old and new in *The Scholar-Gipsy* is closer to Leopardi than to any other modern poet, that, on the face of it, lines 1-6 of stanza xix are a better description of Leopardi than of either Goethe or Tennyson, and that the verbal parallels between these lines and Sainte-Beuve's essay go some way to confirm the hypothesis.

I would add that I suspect Leopardi's influence on Arnold's poetry to have been greater than is commonly recognized: the closest parallels I know to the poems in irregular metre such as *Dover Beach* are the *Canti*.

J. C. MAXWELL

¹ *Portraits contemporains* (Paris, n.d.), iv. 397.

² p. 394.

REVIEWS

The Old English Exodus. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by EDWARD BURROUGHS IRVING, JR. Pp. ix+131 (Yale Studies in English 122). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$5.00; 32s. 6d. net.

There is no poem in Old English at once so intrinsically interesting, so difficult, and so individual in its qualities. It clearly requires and merits far more detailed attention than was possible within the plan of the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* series which includes its last editing by G. P. Krapp (*The Junius Manuscript*, 1931). Nor is F. A. Blackburn's scholarly, though extremely conservative, edition of *Exodus* and *Daniel* (Boston, 1907) any longer obtainable. Since Blackburn's work—the only convenient attempt at a full presentation of the relevant material—much textual and 'source-hunting' study has appeared in periodicals, and the manuscript itself in an excellent facsimile reproduction, with valuable essays on the background to the poem, has become available through the magnificent British Academy volume edited by Israel Gollancz. It was therefore high time that an edition of *Exodus* in accessible form, and cognizant of all the new material, should be taken in hand.

Dr. Irving has conveniently brought together the most valuable solutions of and speculations upon the many problems of both text and interpretation. He has also made some interesting proposals, some of which may be regarded as 'plausible explanations' of obscurities, and he has made a clear and to some extent effective effort to 'define the unique qualities of the poem as concisely as possible'; and this is a valuable literary feature of his workmanlike Introduction.

The Introduction (pp. 1-35) is chiefly to be valued for some new and interesting proposals for rearranging the supposedly misplaced parts of the text of the poem, and for its discussion of the poet's individual stylistic qualities. Its examination of possible sources also includes new speculations on the possible indirect influence of Diodorus Siculus on the geography of the Israelites' journeyings. Not only is a sound defence made of 'Exodus B' (ll. 362-446, the long account of Noah and the flood and of the sacrifice of Isaac), but the rearrangings of ll. 108-24 (dealing with the pillar of fire) proposed by Napier (*M.L.R.*, vi (1911), 165 ff.) and on rather different lines by Gollancz (op. cit., p. lxx) are rationally rejected as unnecessary. The various apparent gaps and misplacings in the manuscript are explained with admirable clarity and illustrated by useful diagrams (pp. 6 and 10): but the editor's new arrangement of the final portions of *Exodus* (ll. 516 to end) on the ground that they are 'confused to the point of incomprehensibility' is perhaps rather attractive for its neatness than acceptable as a valid reconstruction of the poet's intention. For it has little supporting evidence beyond Dr. Irving's very plausible idea that the poem would be greatly improved for the modern reader if it were so rearranged. Without this reshaping, one would certainly think that the OE. poet lacked skill in architectonics as we now judge of such matters; but how can one be sure that he did not?

The least satisfactory parts of the Introduction are the sections on the manuscript itself and on dialect and date. The account of the former is somewhat tenuous, and leaves the reader to seek further light from Gollancz and Krapp; while the linguistic discussion seems to touch merely the surface of the problems. Even the accent-marks of the manuscript are neither listed nor retained in the text. The title of the manuscript is repeatedly wrongly given as *Junius XI* instead of *II*, apparently by confusion with the numbering of the Cottonian collection in the British Museum; for Bodley always uses Arabic figures as against the Roman of the Museum in such items. This mistake was made by Gollancz himself in his facsimile edition. In the discussion of the Anglian elements in the phonology of the manuscript, the editor makes no attempt to distinguish between forms which may be scribal and those which seem to belong to the original poem, though he shows by his note to l. 453 (in which he would change *forhtigende* to the Anglian *forhtende* on grounds of metre) that he is conscious of such a distinction. Again, though the form *onnied* of l. 139 is mentioned as the only Early West-Saxon form in *Exodus*, there is no discussion of what this fact might point to. *Beodan* for WS. *bidon* as pret. pl. (l. 166) is mentioned, but its relation to the dialect of the *Vespasian Psalter Gloss* is not. In fact no attempt is made to reconstruct any sort of textual history for the poem as it appears in the manuscript and to distinguish the various strata of its transmission. It is unlucky that the year 1953 saw the publication—too late for Dr. Irving's use—of Mr. Sisam's outstanding essay on dialect in OE. poetry in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*: for this and other matters in that volume are now indispensable to the editors of OE. texts. The same year produced Professor Magoun's extremely significant article on 'The Oral-formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry' (*Speculum*, xxviii (1953), 446-67) which has particular relevance to the relation between *Exodus* and *Beowulf* as it is discussed here in connexion with the problem of dating: for Mr. Magoun's work may well put an entirely new 'slant' on the matter of possible echoes or imitations of early OE. poems by their successors. On the matter of date, however, Dr. Irving is generally judicious.

The Select Bibliography is admirable; nor is it Dr. Irving's fault that 1953 produced several important items too late for his consideration. Besides the works of Mr. Sisam and of Mr. Magoun noticed above, there was a new edition of Miss Beryl Smalley's *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (listed on p. 41) and an edition of the Mercian *Life of St. Chad* by Dr. R. Vleeskruyer (Amsterdam) which includes a very thorough (if somewhat speculative) study of the whole question of Mercian and its influence, and suggests lines of thought which may be valuable to an editor of such a manuscript as *Junius II* because of evidence that it was probably copied somewhere in the West Midlands.

Dr. Irving's text is well presented. But besides the rearrangement of ll. 516-90, already touched upon, several of his emendations are scarcely acceptable. At l. 145 a rather wild conjecture of Kock's is carried a stage farther by reading *ymb antþigða* for MS. *ymb ðn twig*. Now Kock ('Plain Points and Puzzles', *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*, N.F., Avd. I. Bd. 17, Nr. 26 of 1922) 'creates the word *andþigð* from Germanic **andþigipo*': and the philologist may well think this an extremely ill-starred 'creation' in view of the fact that OE. *onþeōn* (cf. OE. partic.

adj. *geþungen*) must have started any Germanic life it had as a verb of class 3. Again *ingēmend* for the MS. *inge men* of l. 190 involves the creation of a word *ingēmend* 'native ruler' which seems even less probable than the manuscript reading, though this time the emendation has been adopted from a suggestion made verbally by so distinguished a scholar as Professor J. C. Pope. *Inge* for Northumbrian and Mercian *ginge* 'young' is not to be rejected quite so easily: *ging* is found three times in *Elene* and once in *Daniel*, apart from specifically Northumbrian and Mercian texts (see Sievers-Brunner § 92, 1 (a) and Anm. 1, and the *Life of St. Chad*, ed. Vleeskruyer, p. 95). The MS. *inge* for *ginge* should perhaps be emended, though *inge* can be paralleled from the late Middle English *Life of Merlin*, 98, which has 'so small a peple and so *yngre*'. Some other emendations show a choice of the less plausible conjectures of other editors, such as those taken from Sedgefield in ll. 239 (*swol* for MS. *swor* where *spor* is more likely) and l. 313 (where MS. *an* is omitted, though necessary, in reading *on ðnette* for MS. *án on ðrette*). In l. 307 the quite intelligible and metrical MS. *nalles hige gehyrðon* is said to have been emended by the editor 'for the reader's convenience' to *nalles hie gehyr[w]don*, with the very dubious remark that 'actually *hige* is a form of *hie*'; yet both metre and syntax suffer by making the noun *hige* into the personal pronoun *hie*, and the omission of the *w* in the pret. of *hyrwan* is not very unfamiliar in Late OE.

It may here be convenient to discuss a few further points in Dr. Irving's text along with the comments and explanations given in the notes.

Langsumne ræd of l. 6, *ēce lāfe* of l. 370 and *ēce ræðas* of l. 558 (516 in the conventional numbering) should be compared with *Beowulf*, ll. 1201, 1760, and 2719 for meaning and usage.

Lines 30-34 should be taken as one sentence instead of making a new paragraph begin at l. 33, MS. *ingere* emended to *ungere* (a point considered and rejected by the editor), and the word *gedrecced* (which seems to have been altered to *gedrenced* by a scribe) restored. The lines might then read:

Hæfde hē þā geswiðed sōðum cræftum
 ond gewurðodne werodes aldor,
 Faraones fēond, on forðwegas,
 þā wæs ungēre caldum wītum,
 dēaðe gedrecced, drihtfolca mæst.

They might be rendered: 'He (God) had strengthened with true powers and honoured the leader of the host (Moses) Pharaoh's enemy, for his journeyings hence, since (þā . . . þā) the mightiest of peoples had been just lately (ungēre) afflicted (gedrecced) with death, with plagues such as they had suffered formerly (caldum wītum).' This slaying of the Egyptians' first-born was the last of the ten plagues.

Lines 40 and 41 become clear if we read *ðrysmyde* for MS. *dryrmyde* instead of the usual *drysmýde* accepted by the editor. Both here and in *Beowulf* 1375 the verb is in fact *þrysmian* 'to become choked', from the noun *þrosm*. I mentioned this in my edition of *Beowulf* (London, 1953), and it has since been confirmed by a reference to Laurence Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonice* (ed. A. H. Marck-

wardt, Ann Arbor, 1952) where we find recorded *forþrysmān, suffocare*, 'to choke, stifle'. One may confidently, therefore, render *land þrysmde dēadra hræwum* by 'the land was choked with the corpses of the dead'—a characteristically vivid metaphor of our poet.

The interpretation of ll. 44-47 remains obscure, and the explanations in the notes are only new speculations; and the same is true of the immediately following passage. The editor follows Grein-Köhler in taking the crucial word *lāðsið* (MS. *lað sið*) as 'the journey to death', and startlingly makes *heofon* of l. 46 stand for God. But it is at least as likely that the *lāðsið* was the journey of the Israelites, which was 'hateful' to the Egyptians who were forced to allow it; and Krapp and others may well be right in emending *heofon* to *heofung* 'lamentation'. The pointing of the manuscript, too, does not seem to have been sufficiently considered. *Hergas on helle* of l. 46, 'hellish shrines', may be in apposition with *deofolgyld* of the next line. Accepting the common emendation of *frēond* of l. 45 to *fēond*, the passage repunctuated would read as follows:

ālýfed lāðsið lēode grētan;
folc fērende; fēond wæs berēafod.
Hergas on helle, (heofung pider becōm)
druron dēofolgyld.

Of this the rendering might be: 'The journey hateful to the Egyptians (the Exodus) was permitted to the nation (*lēode* dat. sing.) to enter upon. The people (Israelites) was on its way; the Fiend was deprived (of his desire through the release of the Israelites). The hellish shrines, the devil's idols, fell, and lamentation came (upon the Egyptians).' In ll. 47-53 immediately following, *fæsten* is made to mean 'captivity' endured by the Egyptians, and the odd-looking compound *eald[or]wērig* made from the manuscript *eald wērige* with the meaning 'weary of soul' in the notes or 'fatally weary (?)' in the glossary. It might be less precarious to follow P. G. Thomas (*M.L.R.*, xii (1917), 343) in taking *swā* of l. 49 as a relative 'who'. *Mengeo* of l. 48 refers to the Israelites rather than to the 'first-born' of Egypt: metre and palaeographical probability would be well satisfied by inserting *ond* between *eald* and *wērige*; and if *folc* of l. 50 were emended to *folces* the whole passage might become intelligible with the necessary repunctuation:

Dæg wæs mære
ofer middangeard þā sēo mengeo fōr,
swā þæs fæsten drēah fela missēra,
eald ond wērige, Egypta folces,
þæs þe hie wīdeferð wyrnan þōhton
Moyses mægum, gif hie Metod lēte,
on langne lust lēofes siðes.

The rendering of this would be something like: 'Famous was that day throughout the world when the multitude (of the Israelites) departed, those who, ancient and wearied, had thus endured the captivity of the people of the Egyptians because they (the Egyptians) had meant, if the Creator had permitted them, for ever to have refused to Moses' kinsmen the longed-for journey (*lēofes siðes*) to their lasting happiness (*on langne lust*).'

Wælcēasega of l. 164 is something more than the 'carriion-picker' of the glossary: for its semantic development, and its use to describe a bird of prey hovering over the battle-field in a metaphor full of traditional associations from Germanic mythology, deserve some comment (cf. ON. *valkyrja*, and the phrase *wiccan ond wælcerian* in Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Anglos*, &c.).

It might have been worth while to point out some of the verbal parallels with *Beowulf* beyond the famous *enge ānpaðas uncūð gelād* of l. 58 (e.g. the apparent formula in l. 214 and *Beowulf* 387): and these now gain significance in the light of the new approach to this aspect of OE. poetry in Mr. Magoun's article already referred to. In treating of the problem of the alliteration in l. 339, 'ēad ond æðelo; hē wæs gearu swā þeah', the possible **ginge* already discussed for MS. *inge* of l. 190 should be taken into account, and the parallel case of *Genesis* l. 238, 'georne togēnes and sædon ealles þanc', should also be here considered.

Bouterwek's emendation in l. 345 of MS. *ofer gār secges to ofer garsecges gin* is worth consideration in view of the identical formula at l. 431. *Sigetiber* at l. 402 hardly means 'sacrifice for victory' as glossed: and the semantic development of *sige* from its early connexions with magic would repay study (cf. *sigewif* in the OE. *Charms*, *sigecraft* of Laȝamon's *Brut*, *sigaldren* of the *Ancrene Wisse*, *sigaldry* of the *Chester Miracle Cycle*, &c.).

Long vowels are marked throughout this edition, presumably for the help of unadvanced students: but this method inevitably leads to occasional slips or misprints. Thus the adj. *geōmor* always appears with the first vowel marked with a macron instead of the second, and if *werbeam* of l. 487 is 'protecting pillar' its first vowel should be short (cf. *werian*). Again, the use of the circumflex over the *æ* of *gæð* in l. 568 (526), apparently to indicate a contraction, will scarcely help the student to read the necessary four syllables in the three-syllabled half-line *ræd forð gæð* of the manuscript without some suggestion for its expansion.

Though, as has been suggested above, there is a good deal of freedom in the use of conjecture and some linguistic weakness in handling this extraordinarily difficult text, the notes contain much that adds to our knowledge of details, especially in the supplying of often new background-material such as sources and parallels. There is much learned and valuable commentary, particularly on matters of the Scriptures. But the elucidation of the finer points of this knotty poem perhaps calls for a feeling for the language as well as a nose for significant philological matters which could scarcely have been attained without far more experience than Dr. Irving has yet had.

The Glossary is a rather too merely contextual aid to the student, who should probably be encouraged rather to use dictionaries if this is all he is to be given. But there are often very useful discussions on individual words in the Notes, such as that on *sæwicingas* at l. 333. Yet many other semantically or historically interesting words, such as **drihtnē* of l. 163, are provided with nothing more than the free renderings of the Glossary. A few of the meanings given are very free indeed, such as *āwyrġan* 'strangle, corrupt'. *Mæstrāp* has a wrong macron on its first syllable (but this is not found in the text): and there are naturally the same occasional false quantity-marks as in the text.

Dr. Irving's edition of this most exacting and fascinating OE. poem is a com-

petent and well-produced aid to the student. Its strength is in its conveniently collected background-material and in its admirable handling of many matters of the structure of *Exodus*, where the presentation is generally clear and effective. In the editor's wide and lively learning and imaginative perceptiveness there is a good deal to remind us of the genius of the late Robert Menner: and it is gratifying to have here further evidence that the splendid tradition of medieval scholarship at Yale is being kept alive.

The book is well produced, as is the rule with *Yale Studies in English*: but the English price is beyond the purchasing-power of the kind of student for whom it is intended. Nor is so exceptionally difficult a text suitable for the ordinary undergraduate. For the advanced worker Dr. Irving's edition is not full enough or sufficiently exact, especially in linguistic matters. Yet this pleasant and stimulating book may well encourage the hope that some years hence Dr. Irving will give us a fuller and deeper study of this most difficult and interesting of the shorter Anglo-Saxon poems. Meanwhile this edition cannot but serve as a stimulus to other scholars to try their skill further on a text whose almost every line contains a crux or a challenge.

C. L. WRENN

Pearl. Edited by E. V. GORDON. Pp. lx+167. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. 12s. 6d. net.

W. P. Ker was bold enough to mention *Pearl* and the *Paradiso* in the same breath, but it can hardly be said that later criticism has done *Pearl* justice. Furthermore, the last new edition, until the present one, was published nearly fifty years ago, and since then *Pearl* has been the subject of a number of important articles. During this time, too, the whole attitude to medieval literature has changed and it has become a university subject. A new edition of *Pearl* has long been needed and Mrs. Gordon is to be congratulated on the successful completion of her revision of the late Professor E. V. Gordon's edition. Whatever points of detail may come to be questioned, this new edition is an admirably balanced and just representation of the text and of the varied material, linguistic, theological, social, which is needed for an understanding of the poem not only as a document but as poetry. The predominantly literary aim of the edition is to be both praised and emphasized. It implies no disregard for facts nor any lack of scholarship, linguistic or other. It means indeed that a wider range of facts and scholarship than was once thought necessary in the interpretation of literature is now brought systematically to bear. This edition would seem to be the fruit of the wide though unfortunately by no means universal agreement that Middle English texts can no longer be presented as if a mere transcript were all that was needed to make them intelligible to a modern reader, or as if all the help such a reader required were philological notes. A fully adequate understanding of the language is, of course, a primary and fundamental necessity. Properly understood it is the key to the quality of thought and feeling—the literary quality—of the poem. But the philological study of language for its own sake is naturally the concern of

comparatively few, while the literary values concern all. The understanding of literary values in all but contemporary literature demands a knowledge of many things not purely 'literary'. In the present state of affairs that means that no edition of a Middle English text can hope to be generally satisfactory unless it contains more than purely philological means of understanding the author's subject. In the case of *Pearl* it means that besides the fundamental linguistic and textual apparatus, discussion of date, &c., there must also be discussion of many fourteenth-century modes of thought and feeling, especially in theology. Without doing dishonour to the admirable work of Gollancz and Osgood it may be said that now for the first time a full selection of the required material has been presented in an edition of *Pearl*. It is perhaps inevitable that such a generally useful survey of relevant matters as is provided in the Introduction, Notes, and Appendices of this edition may make those with special interests wish for fuller treatment of certain matters, or may provoke argument in matters of interpretation, but the editor and the Clarendon Press have generously served the total interest of the poem in a handsome edition at a very reasonable price. It will make *Pearl* available for teaching to undergraduates, and it is to be hoped that this fine though difficult poem will soon appear in some syllabuses now that some of its difficulties are eased and enough material is given for a firm basis of study.

To turn to details; the fifty-page introduction examines the significance of the varied evidence accumulated about the poem, and discusses the poem's genre, meaning, and effect. It makes a calm, sensible, and just appraisal of the poem's provenance and quality. The editor has not woven the charmingly sentimental fantasies of the nineteenth-century editors about the origin of the poem, but he does consider that the poet intended to convey a sense of personal loss and grief, in contrast to some recent interpretations which would empty the poem of all personal feeling. An excellent passage on the possibility of the 'fictitious I' in fourteenth-century literature supports his argument, which indeed in the light of the poet's own statement (l. 233) seems reasonable enough. It is true that the very obliqueness of the poet's statement emphasizes a certain non-personal element in his treatment of his theme. The editor regards the poet's grief as a starting-point, as the source, so to say, of his intellectual passion, and the recent valuable work on the theology and symbolism of *Pearl* is made full use of. Indeed the editor and his reviser have preserved an admirably balanced appreciation of the special quality of the poem. The controversies over its nature will no doubt continue, and there is sure to be more to be discovered about the theology and about pearl-symbolism which may alter our views somewhat, but the discussion here will remain a valuable basis and a stimulus to further study.

In any edition the text must, of course, be a primary concern. This text is an improvement on its predecessors. The new emendations seem very plausible, while good use has been made of the improvements suggested by Professor Gordon himself, Dr. Onions, and others, since the appearance of the earlier editions. In several cases the manuscript reading has been retained with advantage over former emendations, and some difficulties found by former editors have been quietly smoothed out. The Glossary is complete and is a similar improvement on earlier editions, though it is in the nature of this poem that there may be

doubt
force
The
ing c
to th
show
thou
Mori
Bibli
(whi
cent
T
adeq
Cert
his p
place
diale
In
more
into
only
intel
seem
Pearl

The
P
be
M
a sa
arra
inter
Mid
acco
Rob
MS
pros
foun
the
lang
rela
ship

doubt on the precise interpretation of a few words, used as they often are in forced or unusual meanings.

The chief object of the notes is the careful elucidation of the immediate meaning of the text, and there are useful translations and the guidance very necessary to this poem. In difficult passages the editor does not shirk his responsibility of showing where his preference lies. A fair amount of illustrative material is given, though one could have wished for more at such places as ll. 653, 748, 862, 1063-4. More references might have been given. There is no clear reference to the Biblical 'commentaries' sometimes mentioned. At least the *Glossa Ordinaria* (which may be suspected to lie behind so much literature up to the seventeenth century) should have been referred to by name and edition.

The language is treated in twenty-five pages of Appendixes, and will be found adequate by all except perhaps the student with purely philological interests. Certainly there is enough here for the student of literature, who will neglect it at his peril. Besides a discussion of the metre there is a summation of evidence from place-names and from the poem's rhymes and vocabulary which localizes the dialect of *Pearl* in the southern Pennine region.

In general, it may be said that this edition is well calculated to make *Pearl* more comprehensible and better known. For all the learning which has gone into the study of the poem in the last fifty years it must be admitted that we are only just beginning to understand its peculiar blend of emotional sweetness and intellectual toughness which, though found in other medieval literature, has often seemed alien to later readers. And there are many other problems connected with *Pearl*, not all of them touched on in this edition, which are yet to be solved.

D. S. BREWER

The Metrical Life of St. Robert of Knaresborough. Edited by JOYCE BAZIRE.
Pp. x+148 (Early English Text Society, o.s. 228). London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. 25s. net.

Miss Bazire's edition of *The Metrical Life of St. Robert of Knaresborough* is a satisfying volume. In appearance it has the impressive format and clear arrangement of an Early English Text Society publication; in contents it is interesting, comprehensive, and judiciously balanced. The texts comprise the Middle English pieces in MS. Egerton 3143 (a metrical Life of St. Robert, an account of the foundation of the Trinitarian Order, and three prayers to St. Robert) together with related Latin texts (a Life in prose and one in verse from MS. Egerton 3143 in Appendix A and Appendix C respectively, a comparable prose Life from MS. Harleian 3775 in Appendix B, and an account of the foundation of the Order of the Holy Trinity in Appendix D). The editor in the Introduction describes MS. Egerton 3143 fully, analyses and classifies the language as northern in a section admirably succinct, and lucidly discusses the relationship of the different versions and the problems of origin and authorship. Ample annotations provide chiefly clarifications of the text or historical

documentation. A select glossary and brief bibliography complete this compact edition of a text hitherto printed only in the Roxburghe Club edition of 1824.

MS. Egerton 3143, transcribed in the second half of the fifteenth century, contains a unique collection of material in prose and verse, English and Latin, connected with the life and cult of St. Robert. From scribal errors it can be assumed that this is not an autograph copy. Common authorship for these treatises, or even for the Middle English pieces, is unproven, though the Middle English pieces are shown to be written in the same language and style. Here is a compilation closely linking the Trinitarian Order established at Knaresborough in the first half of the thirteenth century with the saint who died there in 1218. Miss Bazire circumspectly hesitates to press the attractive hypothesis that these readings and prayers were collected in anticipation of the canonization of Robert, though she compares the contents with the 'Officium de S. Ricardo de Hampole', drawn up in hopeful anticipation of the canonization of Richard Rolle. Her attribution of the English metrical life of Robert to a friar at Walknoll is plausible and supported by internal evidence. If the history of the Trinitarian Order in England is ever written, some possible claimant may be found who had close connexions with the only two Trinitarian Houses in the north of England and who possibly had originally been at Knaresborough but moved to the more northerly House. With our present information we should look for him in the second half of the fourteenth century or in the early part of the fifteenth, for his verse has clear affinities in style and vocabulary with the poems of the West Midland Alliterative Revival.

It is to be hoped that Miss Bazire will extend her study of *The Metrical Life of St. Robert* to include a literary survey, for the vocabulary, the alliterative system, the extension of West Midland influence into the north-east all promise to be fruitful themes for research. The text itself is worthy of further consideration. F. Douce found the lines 'Unusually smooth and harmonious', and at least one passage 'eminently beautiful and impressive'. A modern reader may not be quite so enthusiastic, but at least he will be struck by the quiet humour and by an actuality rare in a medieval saint's life, and here reinforced by the editor's pertinent notes on topography and contemporary events. There is little to find fault with in this present edition. Such minor flaws as a detached example (*God*) on p. 17, a misprint on p. 48, l. 210, do not change one's impression of scholarly work carried through with zeal.

PHYLLIS HODGSON

An Exposition of Qui Habitat and Bonum Est in English. Edited by BJÖRN WALLNER. Pp. lxxii+122 (Lund Studies in English XXIII). Lund: Gleerup, 1954. 12 kr.

Here is a critical edition of two more treatises, usefully added to our library of late fourteenth-century English mysticism; since it presents the text of Bodley MS. Vernon Eng. poet. a. 1, with variants from four other manuscripts, it contrasts happily with the inedited state of Walter Hilton. But this medieval

hand-
exage
rubb
and i
On th
and i
of re
imag
from
(pp.
spirit
that t
the a
perio
bare
p. 79
perha
Th
entri
the (l
obvic
dioce
place
of W
in th
term
in th
called
be 's
the f
45-1
noun
Th
Ange
as th
n; K
in ab
that
shoul
loqui
the c
him
by.

handling of Psalms 91 and 92 is not particularly good exegesis; it is marred by exaggeration ('under His feathers' means 'in the words of Holy Writ') and by rubbish ('thy foot against a stone' equates *foot* with *love* and *stone* with *Christ*), and its intrinsic attraction lies in the chance of adding it to the Hiltonic canon. On this point the editor, writing as no frantic mystic himself, preserves a detached and modest attitude, and merely gives us (pp. xxxix-xliv) the interesting tally of resemblances; by these we are led a little nearer to Hilton. Certainly the imagery is more exciting than the editor suggests—similes of the man sheltering from a storm, of the hen and her chicks, of burrs, and of snapping hounds (pp. 2, 10, 75, 76), and metaphors of the eye of the soul, of the palate and spiritual food, and of stinking glue (pp. 27, 67, 76); and other features show that the writer was a conscious stylist, especially the echoing *-nd* and *-ng* endings, the antithesis of the opening paragraph, the oxymoron of p. 48, lines 6-8, the periods and climaxes closing the first treatise, the occasional realism like the *bare skynne* of p. 56, line 6, and the simple and moving English of, for instance, p. 79. But the two expositions are in no marked way Christocentric, and this perhaps keeps them apart from Hilton.

The apparatus is generous, though items like *Anglia* (simply) are not helpful entries in a Bibliography. On the other hand, nothing is achieved by reproducing the (largely irrelevant) Description of the Manuscripts, especially as this repeats obvious errors like *Turmensis* and *Elphmensis* (p. xvi) for the metropolitan and diocesan of Tuam and Elphin, and mauled Latin like *Sine fide in possibile est, placere deo* (p. xvii). The close examination of the dialect adds to our knowledge of West Midland, as exemplified in the Vernon MS., and of North Midland, seen in the other manuscripts. But 'Northern metathesis of *r*' (lxi. 2) is a misleading term for as late as c. 1380; however 'Saxon' *ac* may have been (lxii. 13), it occurs in the *Peterborough Chronicle* for 1137; *priue*, and certainly *siker*, should not be called 'late words' (xliii. 12). Forms showing *e* for Old English *y* need not be 'south-eastern' (xlix); the King's Lynn dialect had this feature, along with the frequent *ē*, from *i* in an open syllable, of the four inferior manuscripts. At 45. 12 the manuscript reading *merpen* might possibly remember the Old English noun *mærdū* 'honour'.

The long errata-slip could be longer. The word *oned*, quoted (103) from *Of Angels' Song* as a participle, is nothing of the sort, but a noun, meaning 'union', as the Thornton reading *anehede* makes clear. *Horstman* (*passim*) had a double *n*; Kelham (xix) is in Notts., not Lincs.; there is no consistency, in the notes, in abbreviating the names of books of the Bible—the use of *John* (100) suggests that *Acta* (100) should be *Acts*, that *Luc.* (99) cannot stand, and that *2 Mos.* (99) should appear as *Exod.* At xiv. 11, read *Didactic*; at 116. 15, *medicine*; at 103. 13, *loquitur*; at xl. 31, *have*; at xlii. 17, *influence of*; at 98. 1, *This is*. To make Hilton the canon of Thurgarton (xxxix) is to suggest some kind of unique status for him there. *A parallel affords* . . . (98. 23) is odd English for *A parallel is afforded by* . . .

BASIL COTTLE

That Soueraine Light. Essays in Honor of Edmund Spenser 1552-1952.

Edited by WILLIAM R. MUELLER and DON CAMERON ALLEN. Pp. iv+133.
 Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1952; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege,
 1953. 24s. net.

It is neither surprising nor inappropriate that the contributions to this memorial volume deal with familiar topics of Spenserian criticism, the structure, ethic and theology of *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser's imagery, his life in Ireland, his associations with Leicester and reactions to the demands of his readers—all of which offer scope for reconsideration. In the first and longest essay J. W. Saunders surveys the poetry of Spenser and of other Elizabethans in its relation to the conflicting tastes of the court, the satellite gentry of the universities and the bourgeoisie as reflected in the contrasting tones of poems circulated in manuscript and printed works, designed to appease the middle-class conscience through a façade of morality, and so to protect poetry from the stigma of folly and worthlessness. *The Shepheardes Calender* offered something for each class of reader. But the problem could not thus easily be resolved in a poem ostensibly homogeneous like *The Faerie Queene*, and Spenser's realization of the difficulty is evident both in the letter to Raleigh and throughout the poem, which consequently 'fails in essential unity' through a persistent sense of strain between *dulce et utile*. The structural anomalies of *The Faerie Queene* and inconsistencies in the letter to Raleigh are viewed from a different angle by W. J. B. Owen, who advances the dubious proposition that in 1590 Spenser intended to recast Books I-III but was prevented from doing so through pressure of time and labour. Kathleen Williams, on the other hand, accepting the poem as it stands, finds within it a unified and consistent world, *eterné in mutabilitie*, cumulative rather than architectural, figured through correspondences and parallels at different levels of being, a symbolic idea 'in which the values of Neo-Platonism and Christianity are familiarly blended'. Of the three papers devoted to individual Legends the most interesting is that of Virgil Whitaker, who relates the Legend of Holiness to the Anglican doctrines of original sin, free will, justification, the Church and the sacraments as propounded in Calvin's *Institutes* and the Thirty-nine Articles, showing that the narrative follows the logical order of theological exposition rather than the chronological course of life. Kerby Neill interprets the degradation of the Red Cross Knight as an allegory of the conflict between truth and falsehood, reason and passion, for which Spenser has drawn considerably on current notions of witchcraft and interpretations of *Orlando Furioso*. J. C. Maxwell, discussing 'The Truancy of Calidore', suggests that the prolonged absence of the hero in Book VI may be attributable to Spenser's difficulty in relating the virtue of courtesy to the general allegorical framework of the poem. Raymond Jenkins surveys the influence of Spenser's life in Ireland upon his poetry, noting especially his representation, from first-hand knowledge, of the evils resulting from lawlessness and political instability. Examination of *The Shepheardes Calender* leads Charles E. Mounts to the conclusion that Leicester's displeasure, referred to in the dedication of *Virgils Gnat*, was aroused through Spenser's indiscreet allusions to the Countess of Leicester. In the concluding essay, which suffers somewhat through overstate-

ment, Rudolf Gottfried attacks the traditional association of Spenser's imagery with painting on the grounds that he could have known but little of pictorial art, is often careless in his descriptions, and habitually subordinates the pictorial to the allegorical.

In content the collection as a whole is worthy of the occasion for which it was produced, the most noteworthy contributions being those of J. W. Saunders, Kathleen Williams, and Virgil Whitaker. It is the more regrettable to find continual evidence of careless proof-reading, e.g. 'Countless' for 'Countess' (heading, throughout, pp. 112-22), 'Red Cross night' (p. 97), 'decidly' (p. 16), 'awart' for 'aware' (p. 92).

B. E. C. DAVIS

Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Legends of Troy. By ROBERT K. PRESSON. Pp. x+165. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953. \$2.50.

Mr. Presson's main purpose in this monograph is to establish and evaluate the sources underlying Shakespeare's play. Such books of Chapman's *Iliades* as were accessible at the time are held to be basic to the presentation of the siege plot. Caxton's treatment is accorded full consideration, but, in general, the medieval influences are, perhaps unwisely, minimized. Mr. Presson reaffirms Shakespeare's indebtedness to Chaucer for the love story but makes no mention of Henryson, whose *Testament* may well have coloured the presentation.

Mr. Presson's demonstration is systematic but laboured, and his addiction to long quotations frequently blunts his arguments. His primary contention seems to be that Shakespeare was profoundly indebted to Chapman, whose *Iliades* are several times referred to as a textbook of Renaissance humanism, and it is presumably this humanism which makes *Troilus and Cressida* a play in which 'the unifying theme is—the Passion-Judgment theme'. I confess that these comprehensive abstractions leave me little the wiser. The alleged 'theme' is, after all, applicable to Shakespearian tragedy as a whole. It is possible enough that, in *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare is provoked by Chapman into contemplating passion and judgement in an unfamiliar and distinctive degree, but Mr. Presson's book, so far as I can see, offers no concrete definition of the implied differentials.

The cardinal error in Mr. Presson's book lies, I think, in its somewhat casual drift from the concrete to the terribly abstract, so that his summary and conclusions offer a vague critical audit reminiscent of the subjective illuminations of our own recent brood of Shakespearian belletrists. He is perhaps right in dissociating himself from those critics who see *Troilus and Cressida* as either a dark comedy or a comical satire, but his assertion that it is not a problem play leaves me unmoved. The problems, as every textual critic knows, began long before the play came to press, and they have certainly not diminished with the years. But Mr. Presson's casual admission of Achilles to the category of 'Shakespeare's principal tragic heroes' furnishes us with a new and quite insoluble problem—if, as seems unlikely, it can be seriously entertained. Precisely how

it has grown out of the contemplation of Shakespeare's sources is entirely beyond my comprehension. On the other hand, I should have expected the close scrutiny of source material to have opened Mr. Presson's eyes to those incongruities of style and structure which, with many things besides, render this play a perpetual and fascinating challenge.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

Shakespeare Survey 7. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. viii+168. Cambridge: University Press, 1954. 18s. net.

The guiding theme of *Shakespeare Survey 7* is style, and the volume gets off to a good start with Miss Bradbrook's able *Fifty Years of the Criticism of Shakespeare's Style*. Professor Gladys Willcock, in *Shakespeare and Elizabethan English*, demonstrates the dramatist's 'co-operation with a linguistically intent and active national mind' and usefully relates his stylistic inheritance to the Elizabethan conception of degree. Mr. George Rylands's complaint in *The Poet and the Player* is that 'our producers and players today—and our audiences—care overmuch for the eye and all too little for the ear'. Whether the remedies he prescribes are the most efficacious may be questioned, but the diagnosis is timely and important. Several of the plays badly need restoring to their rightful place as dramatic poems. *Antony and Cleopatra*, for instance, is distinctly boring when presented simply as an action.

Style is directed to bibliographical ends in Mr. A. C. Partridge's examination of Shakespeare's orthography as revealed in *Venus and Adonis* and certain early quartos, though his conclusions seem rather more positive than the fragmentary and somewhat uncertain evidence justifies. His claim that Q2 of *Hamlet* represents 'the blundering compositor's literal version' is no longer quite adequate, and, in his treatment of capitalization, he loses sight of the fact that majuscule C and I/J were common manuscript forms. Hence,

Or *Iuorie* in an allablaste band,

does not, as he holds, imply that the names of precious stones and substances were normally capitalized. Rather the contrary since 'allablaste' bears no capital. It is a pity that Partridge did not extend his inquiry to cover the three pages of *Sir Thomas More* which suggest, incidentally, that Shakespeare was unusually sparing in his use of capitals. Professor Dover Wilson presents the first part of a wholly successful attempt to instruct the uninitiated in the mysteries of 'the new bibliography'. The 'quasi-autobiographical form' which he essays soon evaporates, but the salient information is communicated with Wilson's customary charm and clarity.

There are three articles dealing with the Elizabethan theatre. Professor Sisson examines the depositions in the suit *Worth v. Baskerville* and gives a lively account of the fortunes of the Red Bull company which throws important light on Heywood, Perkins, and others. He is wrong in stating that the date of Heminge's birth is unknown. In *Vaulting the Rails*, Mr. J. W. Saunders dis-

cusses a number of Shakespearian entries which may have been effected from the yard and across the platform rails. The hypothesis is undeniably an attractive one, but many hard facts must emerge before its probability can be admitted. Dr. W. A. Armstrong, in a lucid and scholarly paper, analyses Edward Alleyn's contemporary reputation and argues convincingly that it was not against him that Hamlet's strictures were directed. His treatment of Hamlet as a perfectionist in all things is excellent.

The notion that Shakespeare was never north of Stratford or south of London dies hard, but internal evidence in favour of a sea-voyage, a sojourn in the Mediterranean, and some familiarity with Italian tends to accumulate. Professor Mario Praz, in *Shakespeare's Italy*, does valuable service by showing that the dramatist's knowledge of Italian things and places is at times curiously minute.

Present-day productions are discussed by Mr. T. C. Kemp, and Mr. F. J. Patrick describes the Birmingham Shakespeare Memorial Library. The year's contributions to Shakespearian study are conscientiously discussed by Professor Clifford Leech, Professor Harold Jenkins, and Dr. J. G. McManaway, and there are the customary international notes. These last remain an embarrassment. Romeo in Oslo looked 'dazzlingly handsome' but Hamlet in Rome looked 'almost Byronic'. The hendecasyllabics of Signor Ludovici's translations are tiresome. A Dutch dissertation treats Hamlet as 'a premonition of the isolation suffered by the artistic mind in later times'. There are no snakes in Iceland!

In general, there is a tendency for the contributors to this volume to take too much for granted. Mr. B. L. Joseph's theories about Elizabethan acting have not yet passed into the realm of established fact, and Professor J. C. Adams's great Globes may, in the fullness of time, leave not a rack behind. Mr. T. S. Eliot's superb achievements in non-dramatic poetry scarcely justify the placid acceptance of his unfortunate excursions into verse-drama. Those who share Mr. Eliot's doubts about the possibility of forging a verse medium suitable for the theatre might profitably revisit Byron, the poet who, next to Shakespeare, perhaps stands most in need of total and sympathetic stylistic analysis at the present time.

J. M. NOSWORTHY

The Accidence of Ben Jonson's Plays, Masques, and Entertainments.

By A. C. PARTRIDGE. Pp. xiv+333. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1953. 21s. net.

Studies in the Syntax of Ben Jonson's Plays. By A. C. PARTRIDGE. Pp. x+104. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1953. 8s. 6d. net.

These are two books in which the good qualities are unfortunately balanced by bad. Altogether praiseworthy are the care and industry shown in the collection and arrangement of the examples and the good sense shown in their interpretation. It is also praiseworthy that Mr. Partridge should realize so clearly that the explanation of aberrant or unusual early Modern English forms must be sought in OE. or ME. and that such books as his must be historical in method;

throughout he endeavours, in the most commendable way, to trace the history of his forms. But this is also his undoing, for on the one hand it soon becomes apparent that he lacks a basic training in philology, and on the other, when he begins these explanations his good judgement deserts him and he embarks on over-ambitious and unnecessary expeditions into territory where he is a stranger. What is worse, he writes in the tone of an expert instructing novices; but in truth his work could not safely be put into the hands of a learner, for it abounds in errors.

He seems somewhat uncertain of the limits of accident, and includes in the first of these volumes much that might with greater propriety be put into the second. But he might plead that historical accident has often given itself rather wide bounds. It seems, however, that he has himself had difficulty in distinguishing between mere graphic variations and true variations of form, and he appeals for a history of English spelling to be written 'before the laws of the Medes and Persians should be allowed to invade English grammar' (p. 9)—though how a history of spelling, a subject with which philologists have long been familiar, can affect grammatical ideas is not clear. His terminology varies strangely; technical terms, which he is willing enough to adopt if they occur in his sources, are used 'alongside of' (a phrase which recurs all too often) popular ones, such as 'clipping' and 'euphony', both of which are favourites.

This lack of the basic technical training reveals itself in two particular ways. The first is that, although Mr. Partridge's correct understanding of his task requires him to go back to OE. and ME., it appears probable that his knowledge of both languages is derived rather from grammars and dictionaries than from reading. Thus he traces *heaven gates* from the rarer late WS. weak gen. sg. *heofenan* (p. 62) rather than the commoner gen. pl. *heofena* (used in singular sense); but in any case the phrase is likely to be a ME. formation modelled on *hell-gate*. On p. 65 he fails to realize that in *two shilling worth* the uninflected gen. pl. represents OE. *scillinga* gen. pl.; he misprints *meardum* dat. pl. 'martens' for *mærdum* 'glories' (p. 28); he twice says (pp. 13, 15) that OE. monosyllabic neuters are uninflected in the plural if they have a long radical *vowel* where he should say *syllable* (one of his first examples is *pund*, with originally short *u*); he seems unaware that *gēar* is masc. as well as neut. in OE. and therefore has plural *gēaras* beside *gēar* (p. 14); and he appears to regard *the kynges daughter of England* as a construction originating in the fifteenth century when in fact it is normal ME., occurring, for example, in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, s.a. 1140. On p. 114, in a note on the etymology of *like* adj., we are told that OE. *lic* was a strong neuter noun, which is accurate but hardly relevant, and the OE. adj. *gelic* gets no mention. Similarly in the volume on Syntax Mr. Partridge on p. 20 commits himself to the statement that compounds, though extremely common in OE. poetry, were rare in prose—a statement which surely no one who had read Anglo-Saxon prose could possibly make.

Again, though Mr. Partridge often essays phonological explanations—more often than is necessary—he has but a sketchy knowledge of English phonology and little comprehension of phonetic processes. He tends to think in terms of spelling rather than sounds; a good, if extreme, example is on p. 121 of the

Accidence, where he speaks of the ordinal form *eight* as developed from *eighth* by 'loss of final *-h*' and in consequence is led to compare *height* < OE. *hēhðu*, which phonetically is an entirely distinct case. On p. 222, after 'explaining' ME. open-syllable lengthening, he proceeds that 'in 14th cent., by analogy, the forms of the first and third person singular of the preterite [of Class IV verbs, e.g. *bar*] often underwent lengthening too'; if this is a way of saying that from *bār* there was formed a new analogical plural *bāren* > *bāren* by open-syllable lengthening, whence by further analogy a new singular *bare* was subsequently derived, it is a very bad way of saying it. Though he uses Gill's *Logonomia Anglica*, he has not troubled to understand properly Gill's phonetic spelling; on p. 273 Gill's *pēz* 'pease' is cited as *pez* as if the long mark were of no account, and on p. 97 Gill's *ouer* 'hour' is actually taken as *hover* (which is of some moment, as silent *h* is the topic Mr. Partridge has under discussion), though a glance at Jiriczek's word-index in his edition of Gill would have prevented the error. It is a sign of Mr. Partridge's unfamiliarity with these more technical branches of philology that he tends to rely on the less satisfactory of the textbooks; he often follows inadequate explanations of Wyld's or Jespersen's when he could have found much better ones in Jordan, Luick, or Ekwall. For example, on p. 84 he cites Jespersen's typically blurred explanation of the origin of the distinction between *my* and *mine*, whereas Jordan § 172 correctly and clearly explains it as depending solely on lack of stress.

Mr. Partridge's historical explanations, even when they are correct (as is happily often the case), are derivative and not based on his own research; he therefore adds little except his examples from Jonson to our knowledge. In particular his work is a striking instance of the common tendency to do one's research not from sources but from *O.E.D.* This does not apply, of course, to his material from Jonson, but it does apply to most of his other material; even a reference to Shelley's use of 'there are bad news' comes from *O.E.D.* It is true that he gives full acknowledgement, both in his preface and often (though far from always) elsewhere; but the point is that this is not, as a reader might well take it to be, newly discovered information. Much of the material culled from *O.E.D.* is irrelevant, and there are instances (e.g. the account of *tidings* on p. 34) where Mr. Partridge seriously misrepresents, because he has not accurately understood, what *O.E.D.* says.

A subject which has particularly attracted Mr. Partridge is the inflexion of nouns in the genitive singular and the plural; but though he has gathered many interesting examples, his explanations are faulty. The OE. (not ME.) voicing of spirants in plurals (p. 35 seq.) and the genitive singular (p. 55 seq.), and the replacement of the old forms by new, is badly expounded; as elsewhere, he does not clearly distinguish between spelling and pronunciation. His account (p. 55) of the analogical reformation of the gen. sg. is wrong as well as clumsy; the voiceless consonant of the nom. sg. was extended to the gen. sg. but not to the pl. in order to give a formal distinction of number, [waifs] 'wife's' being associated with the nom. sg. [waif] and [waivz] dissociated as plural, and the resulting invariable singular stem is the cause (not, as Mr. Partridge assumes, the result) of the *-s* ending of the gen. sg. coming to be regarded as a completely separate

element of flexion that could be added to phrases to give the modern 'group genitive'. On p. 36 he does not make it clear that such ModE. plurals as *roofs* are reformations, not phonetic developments—which is why they are irregular in occurrence. The long history of the possessive ending 's, though careful, is imperceptive. Mr. Partridge seems to regard the apostrophe as an essential part of it, and as somehow distinguishing a 'possessive' from other 'genitives' (cf. p. 53, under 'descriptive genitive'), whereas it is the merest trick of spelling, an irrelevant accident which, though useful in writing, has nothing to do with the true form (the spoken form); he does not seem to realize clearly that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the construction *Mars his sword* had also very largely become a merely written one, concealing a spoken form *Marses* pronounced [marzɪz] (as *Mrs. Sands his maid* sufficiently demonstrates); and he fails to see that the prevalence of this written form and the introduction of the possessive apostrophe (whose late arrival he deplores, p. 43) were both principally due to the widespread vulgar error in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the genitive inflexion [s], [z] or [ɪz], [əz] was actually developed from the pronoun *his*. The apostrophe was intended to mark the supposed omission of *hi* from *his*, not the syncope of unstressed *e* from the ME. inflexion -es, as Mr. Partridge believes, apparently following an old error of Murray's (in *O.E.D.*, s.v. 'Apostrophe²'). It is not fully correct to say (pp. 46, 278) that Shakespeare does not use the apostrophe; in the 1623 Folio, as in Jonson (see pp. 47–49) and in Milton, it is normal though not invariable to use an apostrophe in the genitive of words (chiefly classical and foreign names) ending in vowels (so *Julia's* and *Camillo's* and in Milton *Silva's*), and similarly in the plural whatever the case (*hurricane's*, in Milton *Hydra's*). This usage was not in any way to distinguish the genitive, it is true, but to replace an orthographic *e* which was required to avoid the suggestion that the preceding vowel was short (in early seventeenth-century pronunciation *Julia*, and even *hydra*, had in formal speech a long final vowel with secondary stress), but which, though sometimes printed, was usually replaced by the apostrophe because such forms as *Cynthiaes* look wrong, as if they were formed on *Cynthiae* not *Cynthia*. This, it may be objected, is Shakespeare's printer, not Shakespeare; but it is a printer's convention that is under discussion. Mr. Partridge does not explain this usage accurately, though he recognizes its occurrence in Jonson; he thinks it to show 'that writers intended syncope of the old inflexion -es' (p. 48), but not only is it doubtful whether writers knew that there was 'syncope of the old inflexion', but also this explanation fails to take account of the prevalence of the practice in a particular case. Jonson's use of a similar apostrophe in, for example, *Jove's* and *Caesar's* and in native and anglicized names (e.g. *Turfe's wife*), which is not characteristic of the 1623 Folio or of Milton, is not, however, an extension of this practice; it marks the supposed reduction of *his* to *s*, for it was with such names that the *his* construction originated and was most regular (*Caesar his spirit*, *Turfe his wife*). There are in fact *two* reasons for the apostrophe in Jonson (against one only in the 1623 Folio and Milton), and Mr. Partridge misses the one of more general application, to which our possessive apostrophe is chiefly due. But his lists are exceptionally useful material on which to base explanation, and do show the

(rare) beginnings of the apostrophe in the genitive singular of common nouns as distinct from names.

It would be imprudent to pursue Mr. Partridge into the tangled complexities of English conjugation, to which he necessarily devotes about a third of his *Accidence*; his careful treatment of the pronouns must also be left with the comment that though detailed it is unsatisfactory both in its concepts and, in places, in its account of the facts. It is time to turn to the volume on *Syntax*, which is briefer and more concise and gains by it. It shows the same careful classification of examples, though there are a few that seem misplaced or misconstrued. The explanations, studiously collected from secondary sources, are mostly adequate, but some are poor; thus Mr. Partridge has little conception of the complexities of the relationship in late ME. and ModE. between the verbal noun in *-ing* and the present participle, and in writing that 'full appreciation of the grammatical function of the gerund and participle does not appear to have been reached until the late 17th or early 18th C.' (p. 92) he appears to overlook the fact that in OE. and most of ME. the participle was formally distinct, so that confusion between the two was impossible—the confusion is indeed a ModE. characteristic. He does not realize (p. 17) that the construction *one the truest knight* was not originally a form of partitive ('one of the truest knights'), though it came to be so taken, but equivalent to Latin *unus maximus*, &c., with the meaning 'the very truest knight'—whence the original limitation of this idiom to dependence on *one*, though in early ModE. other numerals were sometimes involved. The section on pronouns, as in the former volume, misuses Wright's *Dialect Grammar*; in particular Mr. Partridge does not realize that what is now dialect was not necessarily so in origin. Many uses of *they* as a demonstrative he classifies as aberrant uses of the personal pronoun, in ignorance apparently that *they* was in origin a demonstrative and only secondarily personal.

But to accumulate detailed corrections is pointless. The chief fault of this volume, though it is generally the more accurate, is that, like the other, it adds nothing but its examples from Jonson to what is already known. The errors, the hesitations, the uncritical dependence on other scholars, contrast strangely and unhappily with the care, industry, and devotion, but their cause is only too clear; Mr. Partridge is not conversant enough with the earlier periods of the language.

E. J. DOBSON

Le Drame de John Ford. By ROBERT DAVRIL. Pp. 554. Paris: Libraire Marcel Didier, 1954. Fr. 1400.

This is by far the lengthiest monograph on Ford which has yet appeared. M. Davril seems to have missed nothing up to and including Sensabaugh's book, if we except S. B. Ewing's study. This was not available to him; and one or two things printed since 1944, in which year his book-list appears to come to an end, have escaped his attention. Of the first 200 pages of his book there is very little that can be said; in these M. Davril amasses with patient industry all that is known about Ford's life, his non-dramatic works, his period

of collaboration, and the sources and affinities of his plays. He has very little of his own to contribute here: a few additional parallels, a rather helpless attempt to build up Ford's character from the formal phrases of a dedication, a couple of new suggestions (about Inez de Castro and *The Broken Heart* and about Ford's authorship of two of the Overburian characters) which he published elsewhere—these things go nowhere near justifying much material lacking in freshness, which threatens to quench all interest in the rest of the book. In this country, at least, M. Davril's study will not replace Miss Sargeant's as a book essential to those who wish to find out the main facts about Ford. A similar view must be taken of the concluding chapters in which Ford's dramatic technique, language and versification, and reputation are discussed. Some interesting observations are made about Ford's language, but the author is too inclined to say things like 'Il y a peu d'auteurs dans la littérature anglaise (et y en a-t-il même?) qui ait fait un usage aussi prodigieux de *of*', and the classifying of images as 'musical', 'religious', 'medical', and so forth was never a very useful exercise.

The middle portion of the book is much more interesting. It is true that M. Davril is harnessed to a severely scholastical system which forbids him to take Ford's plays as the units of discussion, but prescribes that they shall be endlessly dissected—'Les Héroïnes', 'Les Héros', 'Le Sensationnel', 'La Pitié', 'Le Destin', 'La Mort', and so on. This system seems to me quite inimical to the proper study of an Elizabethan play, but M. Davril is hardly to blame for it, and he shows that he has read the plays with ardour and understanding; he has no axe to grind, he has soaked himself in the texts, and he is often able to correct other writers by means of a closer apprehension particularly of the inwardness of Ford's characters: thus he argues against Miss Ellis-Fermor's views on Ford's 'serenity' (p. 389), tackles the difficult problem of the behaviour of Bassanes (pp. 212 ff.), or makes an attempt—I think, unsuccessful—to unravel the goings-on in *Love's Sacrifice* without calling in the Platonic cult to his aid. For one thing his book is especially welcome: his polite repudiation of the views of Mr. Sensabaugh. Here M. Davril judiciously restores a balance which had become gravely upset: we may instance his excellent fifth chapter on Burton's influence, or his extremely sensible discussion of marriage in Ford's plays: 'Ford ne condamne donc pas le mariage légal; il n'attaque pas l'institution à tout prix, mais s'élevant seulement contre le mariage forcé, il réclame un mariage officiel qui soit en même temps un mariage d'amour.' It is to be hoped that he has finally rid our minds of Mr. Sensabaugh's 'clinical' and 'unbridled' dramatist and substituted an altogether freer and finer artist.

PETER URE

On A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle By John Milton. By JOHN ARTHOS. Pp. x+86 (University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology 20). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. \$2.00, 16s. net.

It is not easy to see just what Mr. Arthos is getting at in this study. He discusses briefly the 'power of the sources', and then proceeds to a rather discursive

and n
hard
'befor
count
fables
direct
Mr. A
stress
develo

Th
ment
pretat
of Pro
the ot
been
worse
to che
more

The
Oxi

Th
and in
the p
mann
at ma
relati
a Sol
of rhy
by Ta
of the

Ma
except
effect
Land
a hun
know
Tasso
main
fictio
of Pe
is mo
rule

and meditative survey of the poem, in which a developing thread of argument is hard to trace. Perhaps the most interesting single suggestion is that the Lady 'before her greatest danger, was prepared to destroy Comus' works through counter-magic' (p. 49). This rests on ll. 792-8, with Comus's response: 'She fables not.' But Comus's discomfiture is only momentary. He resumes his direct (non-magical) attack on her will: 'Be wise, and taste.' Just because, as Mr. Arthos insists, the 'struggle between wills' is central, it is unwise to lay the stress he does on the notion of rival magics, which Milton would have had to develop much more fully for it to have structural importance.

The thirty pages of very minute notes go far beyond what is needed to document and explain the essay, but seldom deal incisively with difficulties of interpretation. When Mr. Arthos does raise controversial issues, as in his criticism of Professor Woodhouse on the one side and Professors Brooks and Hardy on the other (pp. 70-71), he makes us feel that a fuller discussion might well have been really helpful. But too often he effaces himself behind his learning; still worse, he tends to efface the poem as well, and does not drive the reader back to check his interpretation point by point with the text, as some less balanced but more clearly focused discussions succeed in doing.

J. C. MAXWELL

The Italian Element in Milton's Verse. By F. T. PRINCE. Pp. xvi+183. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. 12s. 6d. net.

This is a thin little book but muscular, compact with detail expertly selected, and in effect both satisfying and suggestive. Mr. Prince's purpose is to disclose the part played by Italian writing in the formation of Milton's mature epic manner, but in the course of his inquiry he throws light upon Milton's verse at many other points, on the structure of the Sonnets, for instance, on the relation between the *Canzone* and *Lycidas*, the madrigal and 'On Time' and 'At a Solemn Musick', and, most remarkably perhaps, on the skilfully sparing use of rhyme in the choruses of *Samson Agonistes* in connexion with methods used by Tasso and Guarini in the pastorals which owed so much to the classical taste of the Renaissance.

Many of these affinities and influences have been noted before, but, with the exception of Smart's edition of the Sonnets, only in hints or general terms. The effect of Mr. Prince's study is to bring into sharp focus *obiter dicta* of Johnson, Lander, and W. P. Ker. Some of what he has to show, then, we may have 'passed a hundred times nor cared to see' as, for example, the real significance of the known use of Della Casa and the importance of Milton's recommendation of Tasso both as a theorist and as an epic practitioner. Other discoveries lie off the main road and are a scholar's reward; of these the most notable is the identification of the rhyme scheme of the stanzas 'Upon the Circumcision' with that of Petrarch's 'Canzone to the Blessed Virgin'. This is a pretty find, but what is more admirable is that it is not exploited. It is noted as the exception to the rule of Milton's use of his Italian, or, for the matter of that, of any other models;

his constant habit is to imitate creatively modifying what he borrows as he goes, so that what is to be looked for is not a precise pattern but the recognition of a principle and the trick of a method. The principle Mr. Prince concentrates upon is the taste for roughness (*asprezza*) which was to prepare the way for a 'magnificent' style proper for epic and suited also, under the persuasion of Della Casa, Tasso, and Milton, to the occasional sonnet. Italian critics were explicit advocates of the suspended sense achieved by an unusual word order, imitating effects admired in classical literature and designed to stimulate by the demand made upon the reader's attention. The clogging of consonants, the arrangement of vowel sounds for striking and frequent effects of elision, and firm line endings are other devices for the same purpose. These can be traced in Della Casa and displayed liberally in Tasso in sonnets, stanzas, and in the blank verse of *Le Sette Giornate del Mondo Creato*.

The elements of diction and metre are treated separately for convenience, but their interdependence is fully recognized. Encouraged by Italian prosodists Mr. Prince challenges Bridges's assumption that Milton worked to some rule as rigid and elaborate as those which Bridges's analysis of the verse of *Paradise Lost* would suggest. Mr. Prince detects that Bridges himself came to doubt the hypothesis which led him into claiming that 'Milton came to scan his verses in one way, and to read them in another'. He would dismiss it as a fallacy, substituting instead the ruling that the English heroic line 'has a theoretic ten syllables and the tenth syllable must always have, or be capable of being given, a stress; one other stress must fall, in any one line, on either the fourth or the sixth syllable'. While this is refreshing, it is probably too drastic a simplification even for prosody which is directive rather than descriptive in intention. There needs some reference also to the maximum and minimum number of stresses, or at least to the norm which is more than two; but the statement clears a way to recognizing the freedom (as usual a disciplined freedom) of rhythm which an ear as fine and highly trained as Milton's could enjoy.

After the brief discussion of some of the most remarkable effects of the *Samson* choruses to say that there is more to it than that is no insult, because Mr. Prince is plainly aware of this himself and quite unpretentious in his claims, and also because in a matter so subtle it cannot but be true even of the most elaborate analysis.

This book carries conviction because with so good a case its author has had the wisdom to handle the matter with exceptional moderation. The passages in the text and appendixes are well chosen and usefully translated. Two tiny slips are easily set right: *Rous* for *Rouse*; *Unparadised* for *Disparadised* (pp. 148 and 153).

K. M. LEA

Swift's Rhetorical Art. A Study in Structure and Meaning. By MARTIN PRICE. Pp. x+117 (Yale Studies in English, Vol. 123). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$3.75; 30s. net.

With no author is it more difficult to get on plain terms than Swift, the great artist of the plain style. There are many different ways of looking at him and

no one of them by itself is right. Of them all the stylistic approach is likely to be most helpful, because most detached. If on a strict inquiry Swift must be set down as a man less original in thought than forceful in character, it is to the vehicles of his thought we must needs turn in order to explain the singularity of his effect on readers. This is the concern of Dr. Price's book.

Because the book is often difficult to follow it is both just and necessary to have recourse to the prefatory statement of the author's purpose.

This essay is concerned (he says) with structure in Swift's works as it serves to create meaning—and particularly such meaning as redirects attitudes.

It is then a study of Swift's technique, his methods of manipulating the responses of readers, as it

can be traced . . . from the elements of diction and syntax in the sermons and tracts to the rhetorically ordered symbolism of *A Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels*.

In effect the study is less concerned with the elements of formal rhetoric inhering in Swift's art than with his more complex 'architecture of communication'. It deals with some of the more obvious figures, metaphor, allegory, analogy, antithesis, but disregards the many other tropes and 'schemas' of rhetoric which have been elaborately catalogued in recent Elizabethan studies. One would like to know more about Swift's training in traditional rhetoric, a study that still held an important place in the university curriculum of his day. Certainly he admired the *Rhetorica* of Aristotle, and for all his negligence and distaste could not have avoided participation in the set disputations and declamations at Trinity College. The universities, of course, were hidebound in this respect and had not much responded to the progressive anti-rhetorical spirit of the seventeenth century.

This new attitude and the reasons for it are adequately expounded in the first chapter of this book, though it must be emphasized that Bacon was not wholly inimical to rhetoric, 'a science', in his opinion, 'excellent, and excellently well laboured' when directed to its proper function, namely, to

win the Imagination from the Affection's part, and contract a confederacy between the Reason and the Imagination against the Affections.

And, of course, in seeking to express the marriage of rational and empirical methods, in advancing 'the strategy of the middle way' in behaviour and thought, the new spirit (as Price establishes) inevitably required its own special kind of rhetoric. While the plain style was held up as the ideal for expositors in all fields, it had in practice to be a cover for attitudes more subtle. Except in the work of scientists, the plain style, if it was to work effectively upon a growing variety of readers, had to be more than a plain statement of facts. By the eighteenth century this renewal of rhetoric was more usually called wit, and the distinction between the abuse and the right use of rhetoric can in a measure be identified with the difference between 'false wit' and 'true wit', the former persistently used by Swift for the ironic insinuation of the latter.

In dealing with Swift's structural patterns, the author does not make it clear whether they are to be regarded as original or as adaptations of conventional

rhetorical forms. He is concerned, instead, to establish that Swift's methods are a proper counterpart of his deepest convictions about the human predicament in its timeless and temporal aspects. Throughout this argument, as in the author's general discourse on the nature of wit, the directing lights often flicker and go dim. To remark, for example, that in irony and wit 'We have two different kinds of condensation, both verbal but one horizontal and the other vertical' is positively bewildering. He does best when he sticks to literary analysis. One applauds his demonstration that the great success of *The Conduct of the Allies* arose not simply, or mainly, from 'the mere weight of facts' (as Dr. Johnson too negligently judged), but from the astute presentment of those facts in the kind of simplification for which Swift had a gift of art unparalleled. Even more valuable, because less often recognized, is the case made out for the early poems of Swift (so often written off as a false start in his career) as the hatchery of some of his most characteristic prose techniques. On the subject of 'the ironic mask', one of the new commonplaces of Swift criticism, recent studies of the mercantilist theories lying behind *A Modest Proposal* are applied with real critical insight to clear up the confusion (than which none has been more damaging to the plain man's liking for Swift) between the grossness of the Modest Proposer and the covert humanity of Swift himself. Without pretending to follow all the convolutions of the argument, nor yet agreeing about each detail, one can also give a general assent to the claim for the two greatest works, that they employ insinuation (or symbolic) patterns to present man's vice and folly as 'a thorough and terrible inversion of his true goodness'.

This is a short book and a heavy one, closely written and doggedly argued. Undoubtedly it is a work of scholarship from which something can be learnt. But one just wonders what Swift would have made of it. Would he perhaps have included it among those 'Laborious Dissertations in Criticism and Philosophy' which were the pride of the Moderns and the butt of his ridicule? There is more than a whiff of the new pedantry in this doctoral dissertation, and it makes learning look very like dullness. Those who write on Swift's art of communication need not in their own practice abjure that art.

COLIN J. HORNE

The Masks of Jonathan Swift. By WILLIAM BRAGG EWALD, JR. Pp. viii+203. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954. 22s. 6d. net.

Mr. Ewald's book is a painstaking piece of work. In his opening chapter he reviews the use of impersonations for purposes of fiction, irony, and satire, from Swift's day to our own. The use of a mask, the adoption of a *persona*, though frequent with Swift, was not, as it has been with some writers, an indispensable device. Lest his title should mislead, Mr. Ewald warns the reader that 'It would be a mistake to give the impression that Swift's writings are the works of one fictitious author after another'. Approximately no more than one-third are written behind a clearly defined mask.

In illustration we may take two of Swift's letters of advice, a popular literary

form of the day. His *Letter to a Very Young Lady on her Marriage* is written in his own person, and no mask is involved. In his *Letter . . . to a Gentleman Designing for Holy Orders* he writes not as an ecclesiastic but as 'A Lay-Patron', which gives him the opportunity of advising the young man to lay in 'a complete Stock of Human Learning' as well as of divinity, and to acquaint himself with the habits and thoughts of the everyday world. Closely united to this is a much earlier tract, *Sentiments of a Church of England Man*, which, though dated 1708, was probably written in 1704. Here Swift can hardly be described as writing in the fictitious character of a vaguely designated author, for the views he propounds, with moderation and avoidance of extremes, are those he held throughout life. Very different was his tract on the *Abolishing of Christianity*. Here Swift, writing behind a mask, handled irony and wit in support of religion and against the deists with a keenness of edge which he never surpassed. Mr. Ewald's commentary hardly does justice to the superb power of Swift's irony in this pamphlet.

Taking his book as a whole, however, the author is to be accorded praise for the thoroughness in detail and aptness in analytic exposition with which, in chronological order, he traces complete or restricted impersonations adopted by Swift—Bickerstaff, Baudrier, the Drapier, and Gulliver, among others. As interpretative of Swift's writings the concept is not new; but it has never before been the subject of a single treatise. It should enable the reader better to appreciate the outstanding characteristic of Swift's irony, the contrast between the 'matter-of-fact tone and the intensity of his actual message'.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

Blake's Illustrations to the Divine Comedy. By ALBERT S. ROE. Pp. xiv + 220. Princeton: University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. £6. 10s. net.

In 1922, after this main work of Blake's last three years had been dispersed over England, Australia, and America, the National Art Collections Fund published a complete set of reproductions of the 102 drawings. The publication was a limited one of 250 copies. Mr. Roe has performed a most valuable service in the book under review which reproduces those reproductions. He has added reproductions of the seven engravings which Blake made from the drawings, Linnell's two drawings of Blake, and Blake's tempera head of Dante painted for Hayley. These 112 plates constitute the last third of the book. None are in colour and the Dante drawings are something under a quarter of the original size (approximately 9 by 6½ inches against 20½ by 14½), but they are very well done and hardly any detail is lost. The engravings are nearer the original size of 13 by 9½ inches. The order is that of the National Art Collections Fund which was based on Rossetti's. The titles are also Rossetti's. Mr. Roe mentions errors in the order, but there are others. I wish he had been bolder and changed the order when wrong and the titles when unsuitable. Illustrations 2 and 3, for example, should be interchanged as Blake's line-reference to *Inferno*, Canto II, shows. Illustration 3 should be entitled not 'The Mission of Virgil' but 'The Fears of Dante'.

Similarly 15 and 16 should be interchanged, thus bringing 'The Goddess of Fortune' (16) next to 'Plutus' (14) and bringing 'The Stygian Lake' (15) next to the other Stygian Lake drawings (17, 18).

Mr. Roe's first forty pages contain introductory chapters on the history, style, theme, and symbolism of the drawings. The chapter on 'Blake's Symbolism' is offered only 'as a general guide . . . and not as a formula for solving a complex puzzle'. It is based on previous writers, especially, perhaps, Percival and Frye, and serves its purpose. If Wicksteed's *Commentary on Jerusalem* (1954) had been available, it might have tilted the balance further from the Lambeth books and *Vala* towards Blake's later developments. There is one queer mistake (p. 26)—Urizen 'in his fallen state is always represented as blind'.

A 'Commentary on the Individual Drawings' occupies the rest of the book. This is pioneer work. Except quite fragmentarily, it has never been done before. Some errors there must be, but it is an illuminating piece of work done with great care and insight. There can be no question that Mr. Roe's guiding principles, largely learnt from Wicksteed's *Commentary* on the Job series, are right and rightly applied. The result is an impressive exposition, with much reference back to the poems, of much that Blake had to say. Blake's Vision and Dante's sometimes coincided and sometimes clashed. We all know 'Beatrice Addressing Dante from the Car' in the Tate Gallery, but we must henceforth see it differently. It represents 'the Poetic Genius humbling itself to the Female Will', and the three women accompanying the car are no longer Faith, Hope and Charity but sinister 'Daughters of Albion'. The reader who doubts will be convinced when he comes to Drawing 99, 'The Queen of Heaven in Glory', where a sunflower is substituted for the rose and the female figures are characteristically sinister. Vision clashed there. It coincided in 'Lucia carrying Dante in his Sleep'. This is Beulah. 'Blake', says Mr. Roe, 'was seldom able to combine literal illustration of a text and symbolical interpretation of the life of the soul with happier artistic effect than in this beautiful watercolour. Among all of¹ Blake's work it is probably the finest from the standpoint of rich and harmonious color effects.'

Mr. Roe is very helpful in explaining the effectiveness of Blake's composition and in his aesthetic criticism as a whole. He also shows where each drawing is finished or unfinished and where the engravings differ in detail from the drawings. Blake's method of work began with a bold pencil outline, then came erasure, substitution, careful development of one little bit. His habits of literary composition were not very different, but, whereas the short poem or the picture was wholly under his eye as he worked, the long poem was not. So the individual plates of the long poem tended to be developed to the detriment of the poem's continuity or homogeneity. I find something similar in the Dante drawings, but that is because of the clashes between Dante's Vision and Blake's.

¹ I must protest against the all too frequent mannerism 'all of' for 'all', and, though the book as a whole is very well written, there are a number of other phrases or sentences which jolt one out of one's pleasure. Such are 'the list of ones then living' (p. 180) for 'the list of those then living', 'in the case of the present drawing' (p. 186) for 'in this drawing', and 'he is questioning Dante and Virgil as to how they came' (p. 138) for 'he is asking Dante and Virgil how they came'.

It is the clashing and coinciding of their Vision that Mr. Roe expounds. It would be a mistake to accept all he says unquestioningly. I think, for example, that he is too apt to see Urizen behind every beard. I think that some points are missed, e.g. that Plutus's three fingers are raised in sinister blessing (Drawing 14): and in Drawing 9 ('Minos') the male figure on the left does not 'reach eagerly' for the female—she has her hand in his hair and is haling him to Minos, and, perhaps, matrimony. But this beautiful book, expensive though it is, is indispensable. It is a great achievement. If there is a misprint, it has escaped me.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Shelley's Idols of the Cave. By P. H. BUTTER. Pp. vii+228. Edinburgh: University Press, 1954. 15s. net.

Mr. Butter is a true appreciator of Shelley. He is not misled by the charges against him of 'immaturity', 'adulthood', &c., into dismissing a body of work emotionally and intellectually impressive even at a surface glance, and revealing new meanings, human and philosophical, with every fresh reading. In *Shelley's Idols of the Cave*, however, he does not attempt to give a whole view of Shelley's work, but rather, by examining the favourite 'images and clusters of images' which recur so frequently in it, to prove that he was not just a 'sweet singer of meaningless songs', but 'tried to say important things in his poetry, and . . . would wish us to try to understand him'.

The book considers in separate chapters 'Shelley as a Love Poet', his exploration of 'Countries of the Mind' (a large territory covered by a discussion of his tendency to 'represent states of mind by means of images of material things' and his use of personification), his philosophy of the relationship of 'the One and the Many', and his interest in science. The imagery in which Shelley expresses his thoughts on these various subjects, and the symbolism, conscious or unconscious, of this imagery are examined. Notice, for instance, is interestingly drawn to the meaning which the cycle of sea—vapour—cloud—rain—stream—sea had for Shelley. Shelley's habit of symbolizing the mind by a cave, inspiration by a spring or well of water, the infinite or universal by the ocean, God or truth by the sun, &c., is stressed, and we are reminded that when these things are referred to in the poems, intellectual ideas are often being communicated. The last chapters attempt an interpretation of *Prometheus Unbound*, and a summing-up.

While dealing with these topics Mr. Butter gives us analyses, some more, some less complete, of *Alastor*, *Mont Blanc*, *Epipsychidion*, *The Triumph of Life*, and other poems. On most of these he has true things to say, as where, in considering *Epipsychidion*, he points out that the fault of the work is its combination of incompatible elements, the personal and the ideal, and is therefore more in the planning than in the feeling. This makes him feel free to appreciate what, taken in itself, is a very fine poem, composed with something more than Shelley's usual intensity of concentration combined with vagueness of suggestion. Sometimes, however, he seems to me over-anxious about the subordinate meanings and lessons, and inclined to forget both the emotional content of a poem as

a whole, and the 'beauty', Shelley's faith in which is as much his as Keats's claim to our attention. This, I think, is particularly so in the analysis given of the poem on Mont Blanc, where Mr. Butter seems to get bogged in his interpretation owing to his seeking too carefully for traces of 'Berkeleyian idealism' in it. The poem makes sense best when taken as expressive from beginning to end of Shelley's various feelings as to the nature of the eternal mind, questions of the relation of the individual mind to it being only incidental. If we start with a full appreciation of the scene before us as Shelley describes it, the whole holds together well, the associations of ideas being (as usual in Shelley) emotional rather than rational, though the poem is none the less intellectually profound for that.

On the whole the analysis of *Prometheus Unbound* appears to me the least satisfactory part of the book. The chapter headings and the publishers' and Mr. Butter's own words lead us to expect a fairly complete survey of the work, and we hardly get it. Mr. Butter's approach through the imagery, and his laying too great stress on the scientific content (which is interesting rather in a general way in making us see that Shelley truly believed in the compatibility of poetry and science, than for any particular application) are hampering. The conception of Demogorgon, for example, and of his realm underground from whence the 'oracular vapour' steams up, has scarcely had adequate treatment. Mr. Butter should surely have made more use of the *Defence of Poetry* and Shelley's conceptions, expressed there, of both the origins and the ends of human aspiration. His social theories, too (which are generally overstressed by Shelley scholars), seem here too little mentioned. Again, the great Fourth Act can hardly have justice done to it without some attention being paid to its triumphant music. In general, however, Mr. Butter's book wins sympathy on account of its assurance that Shelley is worth the study, and its direction of attention to his unusual associations of ideas and methods of thought generally.

J. W. R. PURSER

Carlyle's Early Reading, to 1834. By HILL SHINE. Pp. iv+354. [Available as exchange from the library of the University of Kentucky.]

A phrase in the 'Acknowledgements', casually revealing that what we are here given is the work of twenty years, will surprise none of the readers—and consultants—of this remarkable book, which consists of a solid introduction and 3,184 annotated items, not to mention a strenuous index. The introduction, no less than the list, is the product of that long labour which has already justified itself in Professor Shine's earlier books and articles on Carlyle.

The first section of the introduction traces Carlyle's reputation, or rather the reputation of the various sections of his work—work done as literary critic, moralist, historian, and 'social and political analyst and prophet'. The long second section provides a weighty, well-organized, and concise account of his mental development up to 1834, a development claimed as 'gradual, organic, thoughtful and carefully tested'. We are left in no doubt as to what Carlyle made of his reading.

Mr. Shine ends section III of his introduction by encouraging somebody else to explore the reading which prepared the way for Carlyle's social writings from *Chartism* to *Latter-day Pamphlets*. No doubt this would be extremely interesting, and materials for the study exist at Yale, which holds the Cromwell materials, and Harvard, which holds the Frederick materials—and there is also a mass of unpublished materials in the National Library of Scotland. Nevertheless, when Professor Shine writes 'My part is finished', we feel that the more important job is now done and available for us in this book. Giving us the reading up to 1834, it gives us the reading that contributed most to the formation of the essential Carlyle.

The third and fourth sections review the impressively abundant and various materials used in preparing the record, and discuss the criteria of admission:

In the present Record Carlyle has been credited with having read an author only when at least one of the following conditions has been fulfilled: when he says he has read the author, or when he makes a formal reference carrying that implication; when he quotes the author, or when he makes a recognizable echo of him; when he uses what seem to be his own words to characterize the author; or when he states a critical judgment on the author.

The book, in paper backs, is produced by means of what is called the 'multilith process', and it is interesting that a few corrections have been made in pen and ink—a printing-house method otherwise obsolete but quite acceptable in books that have the look of typescript.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

Matthew Arnold's *England and the Italian Question*. To which is appended 'Matthew Arnold and the Italian Question' by James Fitzjames Stephen. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by MERLE M. BEVINGTON. Pp. xxx+174. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press; Cambridge: University Press, 1953. 21s. net.

Five Uncollected Essays of Matthew Arnold. Edited by KENNETH ALLOTT. Pp. xiv+107. (Liverpool Reprints 9). Liverpool: University Press, 1953. 6s. net.

In the last decade the exhumation of Matthew Arnold's prose has tended to concentrate on his letters. Those to Sainte-Beuve were utilized by M. Louis Bonnerot in 1947; others to W. E. Gladstone have appeared in the *University of Toronto Quarterly* in 1948 and further letters to Richard Cobden and T. H. Huxley were published in previous issues of the *Review of English Studies*. Now, Mr. Bevington has given us Arnold's first independently published prose work, *England and the Italian Question* (1859), and Mr. Kenneth Allott has edited four of the articles which Arnold contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* between 1882 and 1888 together with the essay on Sainte-Beuve contributed to the ninth edition (1886) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Taken together, these two books illuminate the trajectory of Arnold's social criticism, since they span the beginning and end of his polemic period.

Matthew Arnold's talent for controversy, as he told his sister, was inherited from his father: 'I have often thought', he remarked in August 1859 (the month in which *England and the Italian Question* was published), 'about dear Papa's pamphlets. Whatever talent I have in this direction I certainly inherit from him, for his pamphleteering talent was one of his strongest and most pronounced literary sides, if he had been in the way of developing it. It is the one literary side in which I feel myself in close contact with him, and that is a real pleasure. Even the positive style of statement I inherit.' This 'positive style', as Mr. Bevington shows, was forged by his own industry. His meeting with Sainte-Beuve (who advised him to read *Lui et Elle*) in 1859 undoubtedly fostered this industry, for as Mr. Allott remarks, 'Arnold must have felt the parallel between Sainte-Beuve's course and his own.' In the essay which Mr. Allott prints, Sainte-Beuve's industry excites Arnold's imagination:

Sainte-Beuve could not have been the great critic he was had he not had, at the service of this his love of truth and measure, the conscientious industry of a Benedictine. 'I never have a holiday. On Monday towards noon I lift up my head, and breathe for about an hour; after that the wicket shuts again and I am in my prison cell for seven days.'

The composition of *England and the Italian Question* showed Arnold as an inspector of political ideas. Generated as a result of a mission undertaken for the Education Department, it marked his emergence as a social critic, and Mr. Bevington has been wise to include in this reprint the 'very clever and long answer' (as Arnold himself called it) of Fitzjames Stephen, which appeared in the *Saturday Review* on 13 August 1859. This was the beginning of a continuous duel between Arnold and the *Saturday Review* which was also to have its effect in urbanizing his attitude as well as strengthening it. Arnold certainly took this, his first piece of polemic writing, very seriously. Copies were sent, amongst others, to A. H. Clough, W. E. Gladstone, Richard Cobden, John Bright, Robert Lowe, and R. H. Hutton. Gladstone sent a 'warm note' about it, and Clough saw that at least one copy reached America by sealing a copy across the open edge and addressing it to C. E. Norton at Newport, Rhode Island. It is from this copy that Mr. Bevington has reproduced his text, but unfortunately his edition, which, unlike Mr. Allott's work, has few notes, gives no clue as to the correction which Clough suggested to Arnold.

America was, singularly enough, the theme of three of the five essays which Mr. Allott has assembled. These, published after over twenty years of polemic writing, still retain his 'positive style of statement', although more loose and cursory in construction. Mr. Allott is at pains to show what he calls the 'strategy' of these three American essays 'because of the prickly sensitiveness of Americans to criticism in the eighteen-eighties' and 'because Arnold knew that some of his earlier utterances about the United States had been less than tactful'. This is a good point, particularly applicable to the last of the three American essays, 'Civilisation in the United States' (1888). In this, Arnold's slogans are most lapidary, and slung with deftness and delicacy at their targets: 'the brass and iron sky'; 'the predominance of the common and ignoble, born of the predominance

of th
pers
Y
Mr.
Allo
High
wha
audi
were
anot
thre
was
own
Th
help
Allot
their
seem
On
graph
Mr.
rema
candi
'struc
indus
to the

Subje
MA
25
To
J. Rie
of the
Par
mind'
Lukas
has. Y
as you
the lav
of mat
Prof
theorie
J. J.
1951), I

of the average man'; 'the mere nomenclature of the country acts upon a cultivated person like the incessant pricking of pins'.

Yet Arnold was first and foremost an advocate, and it is most fitting that Mr. Allott should piously include the address which he gave in 1882 at Mr. Allott's own university (then a college) of Liverpool. It is a fitting pendant to *Higher Schools and Universities on the Continent* (1868), itself a powerful plea for what were later called Civic Universities, for Arnold went on to advise his auditors as to what they were to do. Yet even here when he was speaking, as it were, as a professional, the social critic asserts himself, and we are treated to another aphorism: 'If I had to fix upon the great want of this moment of the three principal nations of Europe, I should say that the great want of the French was morality, that the great want of the Germans was civil courage, and that our own great want was lucidity.'

The editorial functions of Mr. Bevington and Mr. Allott differ. Both offer helpful introductions. Mr. Bevington's introduction is twice as long as Mr. Allott's yet his notes are meagre by comparison. Both editors have discharged their functions admirably as regards the reproduction of a suitable text, and it seems perhaps over-captious to offer two small criticisms.

One is that in such a small and expensive volume as Mr. Bevington's, typographical errors like that on p. xvii should not occur. The other is that if Mr. Allott is not afraid of confessing (p. 105 76, l. 22) that he cannot identify a remark, he should at least offer a suggestion as to who was the 'acute and singularly candid American' who read 'A Word about America' and made the remark which 'struck' Arnold 'a good deal' (p. 24, l. 13). He seems to merit as much editorial industry and ingenuity as characters who can be easily identified by reference to the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

Subject and Predicate. A Contribution to the Theory of Syntax. By MANFRED SANDMANN. Pp. xiv+270. Edinburgh: University Press, 1954. 25s. net.

To the author of this work 'it seems that the moment has come to answer J. Ries's call and investigate in a systematic way what—if any—is the usefulness of the terms S and P [= subject and predicate] for the grammarian' (p. 2).

Part I is concerned with the relations of linguistics to the 'sciences of the mind', which are held to include logic. This is not the logician's view; as Lukasiewicz has said, 'logic has no more to do with thinking than mathematics has. You must think, of course, in order to carry out an inference or a proof, as you must think, too, when you have to solve a mathematical problem. But the laws of logic do not concern our thoughts in a greater degree than do those of mathematics.'¹

Professor Sandmann confesses himself disappointed with other scholars' theories of meaning. But his own conclusion is rather bewildering. 'Signs

¹ J. Lukasiewicz, *Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Logic* (Oxford, 1951), pp. 12-13.

operate according to the *quid pro quo* principle, that is to say, we accept them in communication instead of the things-meant which they represent. The whole situation reminds us of commercial life, where we accept a cheque or a banknote instead of hard cash; we do so because the two are equivalent' (p. 60). In other words, the sign *loaf* is a substitute for a loaf, an unsatisfactory substitute no doubt at lunch-time, but quite good enough when we are merely trying to communicate. It would be difficult to think of an odder analogy.

In Part II (Meaning of Subject and Predicate) it turns out that ordinary language is not always adequate to the expression of our ordinary thoughts. 'If . . . the grammatical S is stressed, we shall agree that by *Jill has done it* we "really" wanted to say *The doer of it has been Jill*; and this would be a more correct though less usual form of expression' (p. 103). We shall surely not agree on anything of the sort. Speakers may, of course, sin against the principles of logic, just as they may against those of mathematics or of etiquette. But to say that an established usage is illogical makes no more sense than to say it is unmathematical or unmannerly.

Many arguments in these chapters are difficult to follow; the author tells us very little about his methods, assuming no doubt that their practice will by itself suffice to convince the intelligent reader. For instance, 'we shall say that *son attitude* is the S, *intimidait tout le monde* the P of the statement. Now both S and P are complex and therefore further reducible. Let us begin with the S. We could not conceive the meaning of *son attitude intransigeante* without having previously accepted a statement of the form *son attitude est intransigeante*. This in turn is based on the acceptance of *il a pris une attitude*, which in turn presupposes the acceptance of *il y a une personne définie (= il)*. Here we seem to reach a limit beyond which we are not able to extend our analysis' (p. 111).

There are, of course, individual items here with which one might positively disagree. One might say, for instance, that the meaning of one phrase is perfectly conceivable even if one has never previously accepted a statement of a certain other form. Both linguist and logician may suspect a confusion between *statement* and *sentence*, though the distinction of the linguist is different from that of the logician. But these are minor matters. What the reader would like to know is the method on which the analysis is based. He is presented with a set of sentences, and even if he can accept that each one presupposes the one after, he cannot see why a hundred others would not have served the purpose just as well. He inclines to believe that any other linguist, starting with the same assumptions, would nevertheless have produced an entirely different set of sentences. But he cannot prove this, since the assumptions are never made explicit.

The same difficulty confronts us in the third, largest, and most ambitious part of the work, Representational, Cognitional, and Formulation Grammar (pp. 129-250). 'If we say Caesar travelled from Padua to Rome we see Caesar's action *in fieri*, step after step; but if we go on to speak of *Caesar's travel*, we are connecting up starting-point and goal and all the imaginary points in between' (p. 169). But do we, and are we? A frivolous critic might assert that he sees Julius Caesar travelling in a chariot, sound asleep; that Caesar had no action

to p
con
scie
T
who
Whi
men
posi
the
his s
T
exce
learn
no a
relev
is di
field
espe
with
ferre
they
of hi

The
co
(E
Pa

In
Soci
custo
name
colle
the c
contr
inter
ment
land

Th
They
Celti
Tham
for w
refers

1 p
Referr

to perform, and that a chariot took no steps. A less frivolous critic would have to confess that he had found himself drawn outside the bounds of an empirical science.

The hero of some chapters is an engaging character called the cognizant ego, who seems to be a close colleague of Professor Ryle's 'ghost in the machine'. While we are speaking, the cognizant ego is acting. 'Let us examine the statement *Caesar travelled from Padua to Rome*. Here we see clearly that the prepositions *from* and *to* represent a purely orientational action to be performed by the cognizant ego . . . the orientational action links the travelling Caesar with his starting-point and his goal' (p. 155).

The author does not cite the works of modern logicians or (with two isolated exceptions) of structural linguists. It is difficult to believe that he could have learnt nothing from them. In the journal *Mind* alone (from which he quotes no article of later date than 1891) he might have found several recent papers relevant to questions of meaning (the subject-predicate relationship in particular is discussed in two articles¹ which no linguist would find more remote from his field than many chapters in this work). Among structural linguists J. Kurylowicz especially has been concerned, in papers published over the last twenty years, with the relation between predication and attribution. Mr. Sandmann has preferred to develop his views independently. It will be interesting to see whether they undergo any further development when he confronts them with the views of his contemporaries.

C. E. BAZELL

The Place-Names of Oxfordshire. By MARGARET GELLING, based on material collected by DORIS MARY STENTON. Part I, pp. liii+244; Part II, pp. 245-517 (English Place-Name Society XXIII, XXIV). Cambridge: University Press. Part I, 1953; Part II, 1954. 30s. each part.

In scope and in treatment the two Oxfordshire volumes of the Place-Name Society conform to the established pattern of the series, and maintain the customary high standard of scholarship. To this work, published under the names of Mrs. Margaret Gelling and of Lady Stenton (who from the beginning collected and identified a large proportion of the forms), and produced under the direct supervision of Professor Bruce Dickins, many other scholars have contributed, notably Sir Frank Stenton and Professor A. H. Smith. In the interesting and valuable Introduction, the work of several hands, the arrangement of the material under separate headings (adopted recently in the Cumberland volumes) is definitely to be commended.

The great majority of Oxfordshire place-names are not in any way remarkable. They are in the main of English origin. The small number of Celtic and pre-Celtic names includes *Crouch Hill*, *Icknield Way*, the river-names *Glyme*, *Thame*, *Thames*, *Windrush* and a few more (p. 472), but the majority of the small streams for which early forms have been recorded have English names. *Fowler* (p. 421) refers to the tessellated (OE. *fag*, 'variegated') pavement of a Romano-British

¹ P. T. Geach, 'Subject and Predicate', *Mind*, lix (1950), 461-82; P. F. Strawson, 'On Referring', *ibid.*, pp. 320-44.

house, and *Hordley* Farm, 'treasure wood or clearing' (pp. xvii, 294) 'could refer to treasure buried near Akeman Street in the fourth century or later'. In the field-name *Harowdonehull*, in Woodeaton, the interpretation of the first element as *hearg*, 'heathen temple' has been rendered virtually certain by the results of recent excavations (p. 195), whilst the field-name *Drakenhord*, in Garsington, calls up 'the familiar Old English picture of the dragon guarding its treasure' (p. xx). The evidence for the English settlement of Oxfordshire is sparse, but it would appear that most of Oxfordshire was a border zone, where Angles and Saxons mixed (p. xix). Only a few Scandinavian personal names are compounded in Oxfordshire place-names. Among these we do not find the name of a Dane called Toti who appears in a remarkable Latin charter of 1005-12, printed here, as having purchased land in Oxfordshire from King Æthelred II (the Unready), who, as the charter tells us, employed the purchase money for another payment of Danegeld (p. xxv). Eight or so French names in Oxfordshire can be cited, and instances are also to be found of place-names containing Norman family names, as also of Middle English and Continental names compounded, among the place-names of the county.

In the portion of these volumes which is devoted to the City of Oxford, a considerable amount of the great body of material bearing on the street-names and other local names which had already been brought together, more particularly by the Rev. H. E. Salter, is here dealt with for the first time by experts in place-name study. The editors point out in their sketch of the history of the City of Oxford that 'the beginnings of academic life can be traced to the early twelfth century. Theobald of Étampes was a *magister* teaching in Oxford before 1117, and by 1184, when Gerald of Wales read his works to an admiring audience, the clerks had formed themselves into an organised body' (p. xxiii). References to the sources for these statements are now conveniently at hand in the third volume (1954) of *The Victoria History of the County of Oxford*, pp. 1-2.

Although for most of the local place-names satisfactory etymologies had already been suggested by H. Alexander in *The Place-Names of Oxfordshire* (Oxford, 1912)—which had benefited by suggestions from the late Henry Bradley—and by Professor Ekwall in *The Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, other considerations have sometimes enforced different conclusions. Local knowledge, for instance, has led the editors of the present volumes to reject for *Lidstone*, c. 1235 *Lidenestan* (p. 349), Ekwall's suggestion that this contains the parish name *Enstone* with a distinguishing prefix, in favour of a new interpretation 'Leodwine's stone'. There is a monolith at both places, and the editors consider that *Lidstone* and *Enstone* are both composed of a personal name and the element *stan*. In his *Problems of Place-Name Study* (1929) the late Sir Allen Mawer, in a discussion of the perennial problem of deciding between a personal and a topographical solution in the interpretation of compound place-names with problematic first elements, showed how when direct evidence is lacking, the choice may well depend on a balance of probabilities. Here (as in earlier volumes) the editors tend to favour the personal solution when the personal name in question, even if hitherto unrecorded, conforms to the general pattern of Old English nomenclature. In *Cropredy* (p. 419) the second element

is
cro
the
a v
Sin
lin
at t
it v
*cr
I
nee
rati
ven
N.S
soc
fou
but
tak
e.g.
dia
swa
nam
The
sho
in C
war
(p.
cen
the
mon
Eng
T
not

Eng
en
19
As
in th
and
on n
but
Med
rema

is OE. *riðig*, 'small stream'; the first element is interpreted by Ekwall as OE. *cropp*, 'in some sense, probably referring to some waterplants'. This seems on the whole less likely than the alternative proposed by the editors, namely **Croppa*, a weak form of the strong personal name found in *Cropston* in Leicestershire. Similar instances of alternative explanations will be found under *Tackley*, *Ducklington*, and *Wardington* (pp. 285, 317, 427). The danger of taking place-names at their face value is well illustrated by the Oxfordshire *Churchill* (p. 343) which, it would seem, may originally have been named 'hill with a tumulus' (British **crouco*) rather than 'hill with a church'.

But in the opinion of those responsible for the work under review, the main need for this county was not the reinterpretation of major place-names but rather the treatment of minor names and of as many field-names as could conveniently be handled. In a review of *The Place-Names of Cumberland* (R.E.S., N.S. v (1954), 216) attention was drawn to the wealth of information, agricultural, social, linguistic, and so forth, to be derived from such names. The elements found in Oxfordshire field-names (and major names) make a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the English vocabulary. Some words have been taken back considerably behind their first recorded appearance in other sources, e.g. *cow-bell*, *demon*, *dotard* (pp. 328, 250, 400). Among the many local and dialect words which have been noted among the field-names are *gog*, 'bog, swamp' (p. 447), and *tite*, 'fountain of water' (p. 469). There are many field-names denoting the shape of pieces of land, e.g. *gorebrode*, *lanket*, *shovelbrode*. The term *forthshetere*, *for(e)schetere*, here explained as meaning literally 'forward shooter', from the shape or position of the land, has been noted about ten times in Oxfordshire field-names in sources dating from the thirteenth century onwards; but it 'has not been noted in other counties and is not in the dictionaries' (p. 446). The number of Oxfordshire field-names still surviving in nineteenth-century or later sources, which can be connected with landmarks recorded in the boundaries of Anglo-Saxon charters, as, for example, *Bigberry*, *Fleet Common*, *Fretheless Stone* (pp. xxviii-xxix), is striking evidence of continuity in English field-names.

The editors of these volumes are to be congratulated on the addition of a notable new item to the Place-Name Society's series.

F. E. HARMER

SHORT NOTICES

Englische Literaturgeschichte. By FR. SCHUBEL. I: Die alt- und mittelenglische Periode. Pp. 168 (Sammlung Götschen 1114). Berlin: De Gruyter, 1954. DM. 2.40.

Anyone who tries to write a 'history' of literature in England from Cædmon to Chaucer in this compass sets himself an impossible task. Whatever he does, it cannot be complete; and the prime question of policy is whether readers will wish to have a factual report on nearly every surviving work—author, date, theme, length, metre—or a less detailed, but critical, discussion of a few outstanding achievements. Ker's *English Literature: Mediæval*, on a similar scale to this book, offered the criticism, and after forty years it remains an unsurpassed distillation of the quality of mediæval English writing. Professor

Schubel takes the other course, and gives the facts. He leaves himself little room for criticism and almost none for illustration—there are only four brief quotations from Middle English lyrics. Most of what he says is sound enough, but it makes dull reading.

Naturally little is new. Dr. Schubel claims that recent work in stylistics and cultural history has made it possible to date Old English texts more accurately than before, but his placing of Cynewulf in the last quarter of the eighth century, and of *Genesis B* in the second half of the tenth, does not inspire confidence in this new chronology. The arrangement is sometimes awkward: *Beowulf* is noticed in a chapter headed 'Die heidnische Zeit'; but Dr. Schubel thinks it was written 'wahrscheinlich im Dienste der christlichen Überwindung des auch im 8. Jh. noch nicht getilgten Heidentums' by 'ein wohl dem mercischen Hofe nahestehender Geistlicher' (p. 20), and it seems better suited to the following chapter on 'Die anglische Blütezeit (7. bis 8. Jh.)'.

Dr. Schubel seems to be more interested in Middle than in Old English, and he writes rather more interestingly of it. But too much of the effect of a catalogue remains: five lines on *Sir Orfeo*, half a page on *Gawain* (mostly a summary of the plot), two pages on Langland; and though six pages are given to Chaucer there is no discussion of the special qualities of any one of the *Canterbury Tales*. We could better have spared some of the twenty pages on writings in Latin and Anglo-French.

Some of the opinions expressed are surprising: the Exeter Book is dated c. 1050–72 (p. 13); the first half of the fourteenth century is said to have produced no religious prose worth mentioning (p. 125), though the date of Rolle's death is given correctly. There is a sprinkling of minor errors: *Wonders of the East* is still placed in the eleventh century (p. 56); the battle of Maldon is dated 993 (p. 59), Bannockburn 1340 (p. 151); *The Proverbs of Alfred* is classed as prose (p. 93); Trevisa's translation of Higden is called *Brut or the Chronicles of England* (p. 127). The most notable of the misprints is *Altercatio canis et spiritus* (p. 73).

N. D.

Auckland University College Bulletins, No. 43, English Series, No. 6 (1953), and No. 44, English Series, No. 7 (1954). No price given.

These pamphlets continue to explore the Grey Collection in the Auckland City Library, already noticed in *R.E.S.*, vol. vi, no. 21.

No. 43 by M. K. Joseph is entitled 'Charles Aders' and described as 'a biographical note, together with some unpublished letters addressed to him by S. T. Coleridge and others'. Of the seven letters (all but one short) three are from Coleridge late in life and one each from Francis Danby, Wordsworth, Lamb, and Rogers. The biographical note takes up most of the pamphlet and usefully assembles, chiefly from Crabb Robinson, the available information about the German Aders who spent many years in London, whose picture collection was famous, and at whose house in Euston Square so many artists and men of letters were entertained.

No. 44 by S. Musgrove consists of 'Unpublished Letters of Thomas De Quincey and Elizabeth Barrett Browning', *not*, as the title might suggest, a correspondence between the two. The seven De Quincey letters range from 1809 to 1814, five being written from Grasmere. Books and the Peninsular War are the main topics. The five letters of Mrs. Browning are written to her friend Mrs. Martin and range from 1855 to 1859. One is from London, one from Paris, three from Italy. In Paris 'Charles Dickens lives nearly opposite to us'. In the second letter she encourages her friend to read *Aurora Leigh* because it has been described as 'worse than Don Juan', 'unfit for the reading of any girl'.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

ANGLIA

Band 72, Heft 1, 1954

Ein Beda-Problem (Marie Schütt), pp. 1-20.

Medieval animal lore (Beatrice White), pp. 21-30.

A dramatic fragment from a Caesar Augustus play (Rossell Hope Robbins), pp. 31-34.

Vice, Braggart, and Falstaff (D. C. Boughner), pp. 35-61.

Maria Edgeworth's Essay on Irish Bulls (Teut Riese), pp. 62-77.

Christopher Fry and the revolt against realism in modern English drama (Rudolf Stamm), pp. 78-109.

Band 72, Heft 2/3, 1954

Pall Mall. Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie (Hermann M. Flasdieck), pp. 129-360.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xvi, No. 1, December 1954

An Elizabethan Christmas (Hamish Swanston), pp. 24-26.

[Poem by Peter Mowle, 1601.]

ELH

Vol. xxi, No. 3, September 1954

Milton's Hell (J. B. Broadbent), pp. 161-92.

'Animal rationis capax.' A study of certain aspects of Swift's imagery (Kathleen M. Williams), pp. 193-207.

Passion and permanence in Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn* (Charles I. Patterson), pp. 208-20.

James Joyce: test case for a theory of style (Jackson I. Cope), pp. 221-36.

The satirist and society (Robert C. Elliott), pp. 237-48.

Vol. xxi, No. 4, December 1954

Solitude and the neoclassicists (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 251-73.

Adonais: progressive revelation as a poetic mode (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 274-326.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxv, No. 6, December 1954

Marlowe and the dumb show (Bert Sunesen), pp. 241-53.

Hamlet and the phantom clue (Adrien Bonjour), pp. 253-9.

Þurh þreata geþræcu (Joh. Gerritsen), pp. 259-62.

[In the Leiden Riddle.]

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. iv, No. 4, October 1954

The tragic form (Richard B. Sewall), pp. 345-58.

A note on Jane Austen (C. S. Lewis), pp. 359-71.

Some techniques of fiction in poetry (Alwyn Berland), pp. 372-85.

Communication and the Victorian poet (Kingsley Amis), pp. 386-99.

The Ververs (Joseph J. Firebaugh), pp. 400-10.

[Henry James, *The Golden Bowl*.]

Dylan Thomas's poetry (R. N. Maud), pp. 411-20.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

VII^e Année, No. 4, Octobre 1954

Une curiosité littéraire (L. Cazamian and A. Koszul), pp. 353-61.

[Daniel O'Sullivan, writer on Shakespeare, &c.]

Le 'journal' de Beckford (André Parreaux), pp. 362-79.

Michael Wodhull, maître de Southey

220 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

et disciple de Rousseau (J. Voisine), pp. 380-8.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxiii, No. 1, 1954

The tretis of the tua mariit wemen and the wedo (James Kinsley), pp. 31-35.

Vol. xxiii, No. 2, 1954

Notes on MS. Laud Misc. 636 (Cecily Clark), pp. 71-75.
[Peterborough Chronicle.]

Aseventeenth-centurytext of *Thomas of Erceldoune* (W. P. Albrecht), pp. 88-95.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxi, No. 7, November 1954

Three notes on Old English texts (Elizabeth Suddaby), pp. 465-8.

[*The Wanderer, The Battle of Maldon, OE. Bede.*]

Troilus' confession (Arthur E. Hutson), pp. 468-70.

Why the Devil wears green (D. W. Robertson, Jr.), pp. 470-2.

[In Chaucer's *Friar's Tale*.]

Did Chaucer rearrange the Clerk's envoy? (J. Burke Severs), pp. 472-8.

William Dunbar's 'Steidis' (George Fenwick Jones), pp. 479-80.

Diogenes and *The Boke Named the Governour* (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 481-4.

Spenser and Thomas Watson (William Ringler), pp. 484-7.

Jonson, Camden and the Black Prince's plumes (W. Todd Furniss), pp. 487-8.

Hugh Holland in Turkey (S. G. Culliford), pp. 489-93.

Donne's 'Good-morrow' and cordiform maps (Robert L. Sharp), pp. 493-5.

'A book was writ of late . . .' (Howard Schultz), pp. 495-7.

Eikon Basilike, Eikon Alethine, and

Eikonoklastes (Ernest Sirluck), pp. 497-502.

Three notes on 'Rochester's' poems (Pierre Legouis), pp. 502-6.

The art of reflection in James's *The Sacred Fount* (Charles G. Hoffmann), pp. 507-8.

Vol. lxi, No. 8, December 1954

Swanrad in *Beowulf* (Robert H. Woodward), pp. 544-6.

Gifstol (Arthur E. DuBois), pp. 546-9.

Stubborn (Leo Spitzer), pp. 550-1.

Canterbury Tales A 24 (Paul H. Baum), pp. 551-2.

An unkind mistress (Lambeth MS. 432) (Russell Hope Robbins), pp. 552-8.

The earliest use of 'autumnal' (Lewis Sawin), pp. 558-9.

Donne's 'The Will' (D. C. Allen), pp. 559-60.

Laurence Sterne and Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (Bernard L. Greenberg), pp. 560-2.

Shelley's *Adonais*, 177-179 (Earl R. Wasserman), p. 563.

The Kingsley-Newman controversy and the *Apologia* (Thomas L. Robertson, Jr.), pp. 564-9.

A note on Browning's 'Ben Karshook's Wisdom' (Curtis Dahl), pp. 569-72.

A comment on Section 5 of Whitman's 'Song of Myself' (Clarence Gohdes), pp. 583-6.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xv, No. 3, September 1954

The Revenger's Tragedy: Jacobean dance of death (Samuel Schoenbaum), pp. 201-7.

Swift on the mind: the myth of asepsis (Walter J. Ong), pp. 208-21.

Radical journalism in the 1830's: the *True Sun* and *Weekly True Sun* (Charles H. Vivian), pp. 222-32.

Vol. xv, No. 4, December 1954

In defense of Criseyde (Constance Saintonge), pp. 312-20.

Dr. Samuel Johnson, psychiatrist (Richard B. Hovey), pp. 321-5.

Lytton Strachey and the Victorians (Charles Richard Sanders), pp. 326-42.

Goethe and the Edgeworths (John Hennig), pp. 366-71.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. I, No. 1, January 1955

The texts of 'Mucedorus' (Leo Kirschbaum), pp. 1-5.

Imagery in George Eliot's last novels (Barbara Hardy), pp. 6-14.

Orwell Haven in the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle'? (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 44-45.

How did Shakespeare come to know the 'Decameron'? (Herbert G. Wright), pp. 45-48.

Wordsworth's monody on Lamb: another copy (F. M. Todd), pp. 48-50.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lii, No. 2, November 1954

Literature, philosophy, and the history of ideas (R. S. Crane), pp. 73-83.

The text of *Paradise Lost*: emphatic and unemphatic spellings (Robert Martin Adams), pp. 84-91.

A Russian critic and *Tristram Shandy* (Kenneth E. Harper), pp. 92-99.

Jacob and Esau in *Finnegans Wake* (J. Mitchell Morse), pp. 123-30.

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WALES JOURNAL

Vol. viii, No. 3, Summer 1954

The unpublished letters of Evan Lloyd (Cecil Price), pp. 264-305.

[Continued *ibid.*, pp. 426-48.]

NEOPHILOLOGUS

38ste Jaarg., Afl. 4, 1 October 1954

The problem of order in Shakespeare's histories (Johannes Kleinstück), pp. 268-77.

Free phonetic patterns in Shakespeare's sonnets (David I. Masson), pp. 277-89.

A note on the English translations from Jacob Cats (Rosalie L. Colie), pp. 306-10.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lv, Nos. 5-6, 30 October 1954

Le type moyen anglais *I was wery for wandred* et ses parallèles romans (Leo Spitzer), pp. 161-77.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. ix, No. 3, December 1954

De Quincey and the ending of 'Moby-Dick' (Frederick S. Rockwell), pp. 161-8.

The poor labyrinth: the theme of social injustice in Dickens's 'Great Expectations' (John H. Hagan, Jr.), pp. 169-78.

Thomas Hardy's tragic hero (Ted R. Spivey), pp. 179-91.

Time, space and perspective in Thomas Hardy (Carol Reed Andersen), pp. 192-208.

The epigraph of Conrad's 'Chance' (Bruce Harkness), pp. 209-22.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. i, New Series, No. 11, November 1954

Chaucer's 'Complaint of Mars' (D. S. Brewer), pp. 462-3.

A Chaucerian emendation (James J. McKenzie), p. 463.

William Warner of Cambridge (David W. Becker), pp. 463-5.

John Syminges, a poet's step-father (Baird W. Whitlock), pp. 465-7.

[Continued from *N. & Q.* i. 421-4.]

Shakespeare as parodist (Kenneth Muir), pp. 467-8.

Falstaff's diminution of wit (C. A. Greer), p. 468.

Shakespeare's 'second best bed' and a contemporary parallel (Roland Mushat Frye), pp. 468-9.

Ben Jonson, Markham, and Shakespeare (C. G. Thayer), pp. 469-70.

Thomas Nashe and Shakespeare (Frank W. Bradbrook), p. 470.

'An epistle mendicant' by Ben Jonson (George Burke Johnston), p. 471.

The text of 'The Double Falschood' (Leonard Schwartzstein), pp. 471-2.

Two notes on Milton and Wither (J. Milton French), pp. 472-3.

Milton's 'late court-poet' (Elsie Duncan-Jones), p. 473.

'Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift' (Maurice Johnson), pp. 473-4.

Farquhar: 'The Recruiting Officer' (Robert L. Hough), p. 474.

Sterne's Eliza (H. Bullock), pp. 474-5.

Abridgments of Smollett for children (Lewis M. Knapp), p. 475.

Hume and Johnson (Edward Ruhe), pp. 477-8.

Hugh Blair's three (?) critical dissertations (Edward P. J. Corbett), pp. 478-80.

Correspondence of Edward Gibbon and John Charles Brooke (Francis W. Steer), pp. 480-2.

An uncollected preface by Sir Walter Scott (William Ruff), p. 484.

Bacon and the 'dissociation of sensibility' (Jeanne Andrews), pp. 484-6.
[Continued in *N. & Q.* i. 530-2.]

The feast and the lady (Miriam Allott and R. Gittings), pp. 486-7.
[In Keats.]

Some Marryat letters (R. H. Bowers), pp. 487-8.

Carlyle, Charles Dickens, and Wil-

liam Maccall (K. J. Fielding), pp. 488-90.

French words in Scots (Percy E. Spielmann), pp. 491-3.

'OED' and 'DAE': some comparisons (B. W. A. Massey), pp. 493-7.
[Continued from *N. & Q.* i. 129; cf. *ibid.* i. 522-5.]

Some corrections for O.E.D. (D. S. Bland), p. 497.

'Expense an object' (J. C. Maxwell), p. 497.

Vol. i, New Series, No. 12, December 1954

The moral of the Manciple's Tale (J. D. Elliott), pp. 511-12.

Levels of word-play and figurative signification in More's 'Utopia' (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 512-13.

Peter Moone: the Ipswich gospeller and poet (A. G. Dickens), pp. 513-14.

More references to John Donne (D. J. Drinkwater), pp. 514-15.

'Machine': Hamlet II. ii. 124 (John Waldron), pp. 515-16.

A note on the standard of English translations from the French, 1685-1720 (Margaret Turner), pp. 516-21.

Dryden and Juvenal's grandmother (R. E. Hughes), p. 521.

On the definition of 'tragic irony' (David S. Berkeley), pp. 521-2.

An intentional parody of Pope by Crabbe (Thomas Mabbott), p. 525.

An epitaph attributed to Swift (Colin J. Horne), pp. 525-7.

'Harmonious Jones' and Milton's invocations (Ann Gossman), pp. 527-9.

Blake and Young (G. E. Bentley, Jr.), pp. 529-30.

New letters about Shelley (H. M. Dowling), pp. 532-5.

Yeatsian brevities (George Brandon Saul), pp. 535-6.

A descriptive catalogue of the Calverley material in Toronto University Library (Hilda D. King), pp. 536-9.

[Continued from *N. & Q.* i. 450-3.]

Two possible Housman sources (James J. McKenzie), p. 539.

Vol. ii, New Series, No. 1, January 1955

'The Secret Garden' (R. N. Parkinson), p. 6.

A new approach to the etymology of English 'keelson' (Donald B. Sands), pp. 10-11.

Chaucer: a meaning of 'philosophye' (J. Mitchell Morse), p. 11.

An early reference to John Donne (A. Davenport), p. 12.

Barclay Squire and Grierson's Donne (Macdonald Emslie), pp. 12-13.

'A Midsummer Night's Dream' and 'Romeo and Juliet' (Ernest Schanzer), pp. 13-14.

Iago's nationality (Theodore C. Hoepfner), pp. 14-15.

King Lear iv. 6 (Kenneth Muir), p. 15.

Shakespeare's *Tempest* in Czech (O. F. Babler), pp. 15-16.

'What Heminges and Condell really meant' (K. B. Danks), pp. 16-19.

Field's parody of a murder play (Glenn H. Blayney), pp. 19-20.

Some notes on the vocabulary of John Marston. II. (Gustav Cross), pp. 20-21.

[Continued from *N. & Q.* i. 425-7.]

A 'lost' manuscript of Lodowick Carlell's *Arviragus and Philicia* (James E. Ruoff), pp. 21-22.

A Marvell allusion in Ward's Diary (Dennis Davison), p. 22.

Shakespeare in Dryden's first published poem? (John M. Aden), pp. 22-23.

Aphra Behn (1640?-1689) (P. D. Mundy), p. 23.

A prose fragment wrongly attributed to Gay and Pope (John Butt), pp. 23-25.

Fielding's *Champion* and a publisher's quarrel (John B. Shipley), pp. 25-28.

The text of Wordsworth's prose (W. J. B. Owen), p. 37.

Henry James's revisions for 'The Ambassadors' (Leon Edel), pp. 37-38.

Blake and Yeats (Robert F. Gleckner), p. 38.

Richard Jefferies (Arnold H. J. Baines), p. 38.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxiii, No. 3, July 1954

The captive linnet: a footnote on eighteenth-century sentiment (W. Powell Jones), pp. 330-7.

Dryden and Flecknoe: a conjecture (John Harrington Smith), pp. 338-41.

Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary*: a textual crux (W. R. Keast), pp. 341-7.

Fielding's *An Address to the Electors of Great Britain* (A. Le Roy Greason, Jr.), pp. 347-52.

Vol. xxxiii, No. 4, October 1954

The relationship of Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe (Edwin Haviland Miller), pp. 353-67.

Swift as moralist (James Brown), pp. 368-87.

Defoe and Mrs. Bargrave's story (Rodney M. Baine), pp. 388-95.

Emerson and Arnold's poetry (R. H. Super), pp. 396-403.

Lord Halifax in Gildon's *New Rehearsal* (G. L. Anderson), pp. 423-6.

Benjamin Stillingfleet's *Essay on Conversation*, 1737, and Henry Fielding (Henry K. Miller), pp. 427-8.

Pope's *Anthologia* again (John Sparrow), pp. 428-31.

224 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

A note on Samuel Johnson and the rise of accentual prosodic theory (Paul Fussell), pp. 431-3.

Yeats's Byzantium and Johnson's Lichfield (D. J. Greene), pp. 433-5. Wordsworth and Edward Du Bois (David Bonnell Green), pp. 435-7.

G. A. Simcox, Mr. T. Burns Haber, and Housman's *Hell Gate* (John Sparrow), pp. 437-42.

Bret Harte as a source for James Joyce's 'The Dead' (Gerhard Friedrich), pp. 442-4.

SALTIRE REVIEW

Vol. i, No. 3, Winter 1954

The shocking Sir Walter (Agnes Mure Mackenzie), pp. 18-21.

Towards a Scottish theatre (Michael Langham), pp. 35-40.

Burns in two tongues (R. Crombie Saunders), pp. 41-45.

The Scots Buchanan (W. A. Gatherer), pp. 61-66.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxii, No. 4, Autumn 1954

Lawrence and Class (F. R. Leavis), pp. 535-62.

Morals and motives in *The Spoils of Poynton* (Patrick F. Quinn), pp. 563-77.

What is a poem? (Eliseo Vivas), pp. 578-97.

English poets today. The younger generation (Bonamy Dobrée), pp. 598-620.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. li, No. 4, October 1954

Heroic comedy: a new interpretation of Dryden's *Assignment* (Frank H. Moore), pp. 585-98.

The nineteenth-century actors *versus* the closet critics of Shakespeare (Carol Jones Carlisle), pp. 599-615.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July—December 1954

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1954 the date of each publication.]

BARTLEY, J. O. Teague, Shenkin and Sawney. Being an historical study of the earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish characters in English plays. Cork. pp. xiv+339. 25s.

BATESON, F. W. Wordsworth. A Re-Interpretation. pp. x+227. 21s.

BENNETT, J. W. The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville (Modern Language Association of America). New York, 1954; London, 1955. pp. xii+436. \$6.70; 52s.

THE BIBLE. Described by Christian Scholars. (The Times.) 1s.

BOLGAR, R. R. The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries. Cambridge. pp. viii+592. 45s.

BOSTOCK, J. K. A Handbook on Old High German Literature. Oxford, 1955. pp. x+257. 25s.

BRITISH ACADEMY. Proceedings Vol. XXXIX, 1953. pp. xiv+368. 63s.

BUXTON, J. Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance. pp. xii+284. 18s.

CLARK, H. H. Transitions in American Literary History. Durham, North Carolina, 1953; London. pp. xvi+479. 45s.

CLARK, W. S. The Early Irish Stage. The Beginnings to 1720. Oxford, 1955. pp. xii+227. 30s.

CRAWFILL, T. M., and BRUCE, D. H. Barnaby Rich. A short biography. Austin, 1953; Edinburgh. pp. x+135. 10s. 6d.

DEFOE, D. Letters, ed. G. H. Healey. Oxford, 1955. pp. xxii+506. 42s.

DEROLEZ, R. Runica Manuscripta. The English Tradition. Brugge. pp. lxiv+455. No price given.

DONNE, J. Sermons Vol. VII, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Berkeley and Los Angeles; London. pp. vi+463. 56s. 6d.

EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. Ancrene Riwle, ed. from Gonville and Caius College MS. by R. M. Wilson. pp. xiv+87. 25s.

- ELIOT, G. Letters, ed. G. S. Haight. New Haven; London. Vol. I. pp. lxxx+375; Vol. II. pp. viii+513; Vol. III. pp. viii+475. £7. 7s.
- EVANS, J. John Ruskin. pp. 447. 25s.
- FALKNER, J. M. The Nebuly Coat and The Lost Stradivarius. (repr.) pp. xiv+564. 8s. 6d.
- FEDERLE, W. Robert Browning's Dramatisches Experiment. Pfaffikon-Zurich. pp. 128. No price given.
- FRENCH, J. M. The Life Records of John Milton, Vol. III, 1651-1654. New Brunswick, New Jersey. pp. viii+470. \$7.50.
- FUSON, B. W. The Poet and his Mask. Parkville, Missouri. pp. 27. No price given.
- GAGEN, J. The New Woman. Her emergence in English Drama (1600-1730). New York. pp. 193. \$3.50.
- GARDNER, S. Infinity on the Anvil. A Critical Study of Blake's Poetry. Oxford. pp. viii+160. 17s. 6d.
- HAYMAKER, R. E. From Pampas to Hedge-rows and Downs. A Study of W. H. Hudson. New York. pp. 398. \$5.
- HERON, H. The Kayes of Counsaile. A Newe Discourse of Morall Philosophie (1579), ed. V. B. Heltzel. Liverpool. pp. xxii+103. 6s.
- HOOVER, B. B. Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953; London. pp. xi+227. 21s.
- HUMPHREY, R. Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel. Berkeley and Los Angeles; London. pp. viii+127. 21s.
- HUMPHREYS, A. R. The Augustan World. Life and Letters in Eighteenth-Century England. pp. x+283. 16s.
- JOHNSTON, G. B. Poems of Ben Jonson. pp. liv+353. 18s.
- KARLBERG, G. The English Interrogative Pronouns. Stockholm. pp. 353. Sw. Cr. 18.
- KNIGHT, G. W. Laureate of Peace. On the genius of Alexander Pope. pp. viii+187. 21s.
- LANDA, L. A. Swift and the Church of Ireland. Oxford. pp. xvi+206. 21s.
- LECLAIRE, L. A General Analytical Bibliography of the Regional Novelists of the British Isles, 1800-1950. Paris. pp. 399. No price given.
- Le Roman régionaliste dans les Îles Britanniques, 1800-1950. Paris. pp. 300. No price given.
- LEWIS, C. S. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding Drama. Oxford. pp. viii+696. 30s.
- LINDSAY, Sir D. Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estais, ed. J. Kinsley. pp. 236. 21s.
- LIPTZIN, S. The English Legend of Heinrich Heine. New York. pp. x+191. \$3.
- LOCKE, L. G. Tillotson. A Study in Seventeenth-century Literature. Copenhagen. pp. 187. Dan. Cr. 23.
- LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY STUDIES. Humanities Series, 5. Baton Rouge, Louisiana. pp. vi+54. \$2.
- MARLOWE, C. Edoardo II, ed. G. Baldini. Firenze. pp. civ+305. L. 1,200.
- MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Part F 1. Ann Arbor; London. pp. 373-500. 21s.
- MUNBY, A. N. L. The Formation of the Phillips Library up to the year 1840. Cambridge. pp. xii+177. 18s.
- OJALA, A. Aestheticism and Oscar Wilde. Part I, Life and Letters. Helsinki. pp. 231. 800 Mk.
- OPPEL, H. Der Einfluss der englischen Literatur auf die deutsche. Berlin. pp. 49. DM. 5.80.
- PALMER, R. G. Seneca's De Remediis Fortuitorum and the Elizabethans. Chicago, 1953. pp. x+66. No price given.
- PELLEGRINI, G. Il teatro di John Marston. Pisa, 1952. pp. 219. L. 2,200.
- PETTIT, H. A Bibliography of Young's Night-Thoughts. Boulder, Colorado. pp. iv+52. \$1.5.
- POPE, A. Minor Poems, ed. N. Ault and J. Butt (Twickenham edn.). pp. xxii+492. 45s.
- PRATT, W. W. (ed.) Galveston Island. The Journal of Francis Sheridan, 1839-1840. Austin; Edinburgh. pp. xx+172. 12s. 6d.
- PROUTY, C. T. The Contention and Shakespeare's 2 Henry VI. New Haven; London. pp. x+157. \$4; 32s.
- QUIRK, R. The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry. New Haven; London. pp. xiv+148. 32s.
- RENAISSANCE PAPERS. University of South Carolina. pp. 92. No price given.
- SCHAAR, C. Some types of narrative in Chaucer's poetry. Lund; Copenhagen. pp. 293. Sw. Cr. 26.
- SCHIRMER, W. F. Glück und Ende der

- Könige in Shakespeares Historien. Köln. pp. 18. DM. 1.60.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. King John, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann (Arden edn.). pp. lxxvi + 176. 18s.
- As You Like It, ed. S. C. Burchell. pp. viii + 121; Macbeth, ed. E. M. Waith. pp. viii + 138; Romeo and Juliet, ed. R. Hosley. pp. viii + 174; The Taming of the Shrew, ed. T. G. Bergen. pp. viii + 125; Twelfth Night, ed. W. P. Holden. pp. vii + 144 (Yale Shakespeare, revd. edn.). New Haven; London. Each \$1.50; 12s.
- SHARROCK, R. John Bunyan. pp. 163. 8s. 6d.
- SIR ORFEO, ed. A. J. Bliss (Oxford English Monographs). pp. lii + 79. Oxford. 15s.
- SPRAIGHT, R. William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival. pp. 302. 21s.
- SPENSER, E. Amoretti & Epithalamion, ed. A. M. Crino. Firenze. pp. 195. L. 1,500.
- SPIKER, S. Indexing Your Book. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. xii + 28. 50 c.
- SUPER, R. H. Walter Savage Landor. A Biography. New York. pp. xvi + 654. \$7.50.
- TILLOTSON, G. Thackeray the Novelist. Cambridge. pp. xvi + 312. 22s. 6d.
- UHLER, J. E. Morley's Canzonets for Two Voices. Baton Rouge, Louisiana. pp. iv + 18 + lvi. \$2.50.
- WALTON, W. Troilus and Cressida. Opera in three Acts. Libretto by Christopher Hassall. pp. 71. 3s. 6d.
- WARNER, A. Shakespeare in the Tropics. pp. iv + 26. 2s. 6d.
- WILKINS, E. H. A History of Italian Literature. Harvard; London. pp. xii + 523. 45s.
- WIMSATT, W. K., Jr. The Verbal Icon. University of Kentucky. pp. xviii + 299. \$4.
- WORDSWORTH, W. Poetical Works, ed. E. de Selincourt and H. Darbishire. Vol. III (2nd edn.). Oxford. pp. xxiv + 596. 35s.
- YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES. Vol. XXXIII, 1952, ed. F. S. Boas and B. White. pp. 307. 21s.
- ZANDVOORT, R. W. Collected Papers. Groningen. pp. viii + 186. Fl. 7.90.

.
o
o.
a
r
.
n
-
l.
o.
l.
e.
o.
l.
3.
s.